

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. X

AUGUST, 1944

No. 3



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME X

AUGUST, 1944

NUMBER 3

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
at 216 Main Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

BOARD OF EDITORS

PAUL H. BUCK
Harvard University

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina

WESLEY F. CRAVEN
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
University of Texas

ELLA LONN
Goucher College

BELL I. WILEY
University of Mississippi

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON
Louisiana State University

BERNARD MAYO
University of Virginia

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

HENRY L. SWINT, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME X

AUGUST, 1944

NUMBER 3



Copyright, 1944, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Some Northern Wartime Attitudes Toward the Post-Civil War South.</i> By George Winston Smith.....	253
<i>A Chapter of Panton, Leslie and Company.</i> By Robert S. Cotterill.....	275
<i>Economic Sectionalism in Georgia Politics, 1825-1855.</i> By Paul Murray... ..	293
<i>The Tennessee Whigs and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill.</i> By Joseph H. Parks	308
<i>William L. Yancey's Transition from Unionism to State Rights.</i> By Austin L. Venable	331
 <i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Notes on the Civil War Correspondence of Private Henry Tucker. By Hubert A. Coleman.....	343
 <i>Book Reviews</i>	
Wish, <i>George Fitzhugh: Propagandist of the Old South</i> , by Kathleen Bruce..	356
Curti, <i>The Growth of American Thought</i> , by Avery O. Craven.....	359
Ramsdell, <i>Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy</i> , by Ella Lonn.....	360
McKeithan, <i>A Collection of Hayne Letters</i> , by Richmond C. Beatty... ..	362
Sellers, <i>The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943</i> , by Clarence P. Denman	364
Dabney, <i>One Hundred Great Years: The Story of the Times-Picayune from Its Founding to 1940</i> , by Raymond B. Nixon.....	365
Clark, <i>Pills, Petticoats, and Plows: The Southern Country Store</i> , by Lewis E. Atherton	366
Brooks, <i>Walter Clark, Fighting Judge</i> , by Christopher Crittenden.....	369
 <i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
The Annual Meeting	371
Personal	372
Historical Societies	373
Bibliographical	375
 <i>Contributors</i>	386

Some Northern Wartime Attitudes Toward the Post-Civil War South

BY GEORGE WINSTON SMITH

The Yankee carpetbagger frequently is identified with scenes of reconstruction in the post-Civil War South. As a camp follower, a predatory storekeeper in occupied territory, a cotton dealer, a grafting official, a land speculator, or in numerous other guises, he was equally a phenomenon of the Civil War itself. Moreover, both during the war and afterward, he can best be defined as a precursor, an advance agent of more powerful forces which might well be given the collective title of "carpetbag imperialism." To see the carpetbagger at work solely in the South is to emphasize him as an intrusive element soon to withdraw, with few exceptions, from a land he could neither understand nor conquer. On the other hand, to stress the ideas that impelled him into the southern milieu would be to relate him to the pattern of an expanding northern industrial society which continued to transform the South long after carpetbagging adventurers had passed from the stage. For this reason, northern wartime attitudes about the post-Civil War South have a degree of immediacy.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, there was a prevailing opinion among traders, manufacturers, and other members of northern middle-class society, that support of the Federal government in vigorous measures was essential to preserve and foster the economic interests of their section.¹ Antislavery arguments had long before held that the slave

¹ J. M. Pinkerton to Jay Cooke, April 22, 1861, Cooke Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia); H. C. Fahnestock to *id.*, April 29, 1861, *ibid.*; George S. Boutwell to Charles Sumner, April 13, 1861, Sumner Papers, LI (Widener Library, Harvard University); Hiram Barney to Salmon P. Chase, April 21, 1861, Chase

labor system was hostile to the North's prosperity. For a generation, propagandists had presented the South to the northern people as an effete civilization where slavery's blighting influence prevented full development of its resources.² With this conviction, many Northerners believed that the displacement of southern plantation society would produce a new and better culture. The new South, said ante-bellum doctrinaires, would adopt the characteristics of northern economy. There would be paid laborers, savings banks, free schools, and small farms in abundance—diversified economic life would lead to Utopia.³

Papers, I (Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library); Edwin M. Stanton to John A. Dix, April 8, 1861, cited in Morgan Dix (ed.), *Memoirs of John Adams Dix*, 2 vols. (New York, 1883), II, 4-5; Francis Lieber to Peletiah Perit, September 13, 1861, cited in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review* (Title varies, New York, 1840-1870), XLV (1861), 515; August Belmont to Baron Lionel de Rothschild, May 21, 1861, in [August Belmont], *A Few Letters and Speeches of the Late Civil War* (New York, 1870), 33; "Commercial and Financial," in *The Independent*, April 11, 1861; Lorin Blodget, "The Attack on Fort Sumter," in *Twenty-Ninth Annual Report of the Philadelphia Board of Trade . . . February 3, 1862* (Philadelphia, 1862), 8; "Abolition and Coercion," in *New York Times*, April 12, 1861; "Prompt Action Demanded—Carry the War South!" *ibid.*, April 18, 1861; "The Progress of the War," *ibid.*, May 1, 1861; "Probable Revival in Business Arising out of the War," in *New York Herald*, April 16, 1861; Rev. [Henry W.] Bellows, "Duty and Interest Identical in the Present Crisis," in *New York Daily Tribune*, April 15, 1861; [John W. Forney], "Letter from 'Occasional,'" in *Philadelphia Press*, April 4, 1861; "In Time of Peace Prepare for War," *ibid.*, April 9, 1861; Victor S. Clark, "The Influence of Manufactures upon Political Sentiment in the United States from 1820 to 1860," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXII (1916), 63; Edith E. Ware, *Political Opinion in Massachusetts during Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York, 1916), 69; Philip S. Foner, *Business and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, 1941), especially 297-317.

² See, for example, statement of Henry B. Stanton, cited in *Sixth Annual Report . . . of the American Anti-Slavery Society* (New York, 1839), 19; John G. Palfrey, "[The Slave Power] Its Tyranny Over the Non-Slaveholders of the South," in *Papers on the Slave Power First Published in the "Boston Whig"* (Boston, 1846), 52-53; Henry Chase and Charles W. Sanborn, *The North and the South . . .* (Boston, 1856), 62-64; "'One Who Knows Virginia' to the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune," in *New York Daily Tribune*, April 10, 1857; Avery O. Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War* (New York, 1942), 147-48.

³ "Virginia and New England Compared," in *The National Magazine and Industrial Record* (Title varies, New York, 1845-1846), I (1845), 51-55; "The Seven Wonders of New England, In the Eyes of a Southern Traveller," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* (Title varies, Philadelphia, 1848-1859), I (1848), 81-83; "How Industry Thrives and Towns Grow Up . . .," *ibid.*, 345; "The Slave Question," *ibid.*, 401-411; William Cullen Bryant, *Letters of a Traveller . . .* (New York, 1850), 349; Henry C. Carey, *The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign; Why It Exists, and How It May Be Extinguished* (Philadelphia, 1862), especially 113-14; "What Raises the Value of Land," in *New York Evening Post*, February 28, 1857; Andrew W. Crandall, *Early History of the Republican Party* (Boston, 1930), 76.

With a number of zealots, development of the South through "free labor" became more than a formula; it took on the aspects of a fetish and inspired the ardor of a crusade. In the 1850's, there was at least one attempt, sponsored by a group of New York business men, to colonize Yankee "free labor" immigrants in the border states of the Upper South.⁴ Though the venture failed to achieve a social transformation, there were those who remained convinced that financial gain and social reform might coincide with northern migration to the South. During the summer of 1860, no less stable a northern citizen than Hamilton Fish was reputed to have confided to a group of friends that "the South was or would be splendid colonies to the North."⁵ When the fall of Sumter precipitated armed conflict, such proposals came forth once again into the light. Then, the relatively conservative *New York Times* suggested: "It is about time now that Virginia . . . should be opened up for the occupation and settlement of free white men . . . by inviting immigration to her towns and cities, and by guaranteeing and protecting the homesteads of all who will manfully and loyally labor for her regeneration."⁶

Indeed, wartime arguments for the Union cause added considerable momentum to the imperialistic drift. For, it was affirmed, war necessarily drew in its train the agencies of progress. War had ushered in every great feat in national betterment—witness the rise of modern Britain, Prussia, and France. In Asia, too, China's gates had been

⁴ "A Northern Emigrant Aid Society," in *New York Herald*, February 28, 1857; "The American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company Fully Organized," *ibid.*, May 11, 1857; "Thayer's Emigration Scheme," in *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, June 13, 1857; "Commercial Resources of Virginia," in *Boston Daily Advertiser*, June 9, 1857; *Philadelphia Ledger*, cited in *Worcester Daily Spy*, December 2, 1857; Franklin P. Rice, *The Life of Eli Thayer*, Chapters 20-21 (Typescript copy, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Elizabeth K. McClintic, "Ceredo: An Experiment in Colonization and a Dream of Empire," in *West Virginia Review* (Charleston, 1923-), XV (1938), 168-70, 189-90, 198-200, 232-34, 254.

⁵ Thomas H. Turner to Hamilton Fish, November 28, 1860, Fish Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); E. Peshine Smith to Henry C. Carey, December 19, 1859, Carey Papers (Edward Carey Gardiner Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library); L. Maria Child to John C. Underwood, December 6, 1860, Underwood Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Neal Dow, "The Southern Madness: What May Come of It," in *The Independent*, February 21, 1861.

⁶ "Redemption of Virginia," in *New York Times*, April 28, 1861.

"opened by the redeeming influence of force."⁷ And, Edward Everett Hale, the Unitarian scholar, added, "The days are at an end when the Japanese policy of exclusion kept the South from the light of the century."⁸ Hale and like-minded idealists were certain that it was New England's cultural mission to occupy the South "with free and intelligent labor."⁹

Admittedly, the South did not attract as much attention as the fabulous West. Yet, in several respects, propagandists were able to claim advantages for the South, chief among which were proximity to northern markets and a favorable climate. As the Union armies began to move southward, descriptions and sketches of the country they were encountering began to appear in the northern prints.¹⁰ Profuse correspondence of the Yankees then in the South filled many columns. With praise for Louisiana, one of them besought: "Oh for a thousand

⁷ "The Resurrection of Patriotism," *ibid.*, April 16, 1861; "The Benefits of a Fight," *ibid.*, April 20, 1861; "The War as Regenerative of the South," *ibid.*, December 5, 1863; "The Uprising of the Country," in *New York Daily Tribune*, April 17, 1861.

⁸ Edward E. Hale, *The Future Civilization of the South: A Sermon Preached on the 13th of April, 1862 at the South Congregational Church, Boston* (Boston, 1862), 16.

⁹ *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, May 19, 1863, cited in *New England Loyal Publication Society Broadside*, No. 71 [May 29, 1863]; Wendell Phillips, cited in Ware, *Political Opinion in Massachusetts*, 105; Henry A. Hurlbut, cited in "Proceedings," *Fifty-Eighth Anniversary Celebration of the New England Society in the City of New York . . . December 22, 1863* (New York, 1864), 5-6; "Yankeeization," in *Harper's Weekly* (New York, 1857-1916), VI (1862), 658-59; Lyman Abbott, "Southern Evangelization," in *New Englander* (Title varies, New Haven, 1843-), XXIII (1864), 708; "Great Anniversary Meeting in New York . . . Speech of Hon. George Bancroft," in *Philadelphia Press*, April 22, 1863; Richard L. Power, "A Crusade to Extend Yankee Culture, 1820-1865," in *New England Quarterly* (Baltimore, Maryland, Norwood, Massachusetts, 1928-), XIII (1940), 644; Henry L. Swint, *The Northern Teacher in the South, 1862-1870* (Nashville, 1941), especially 57-62. Some northern wartime journalists attempted to capitalize upon the crusading attitudes. Cf. Junius H. Browne, *Four Years in Secessia; Adventures Within and Beyond the Union Lines . . .* (Hartford, 1865), 444-45; Edmund Kirke [James R. Gilmore], *Down in Tennessee and Back by Way of Richmond* (London, 1864), 192-94.

¹⁰ Frederick Kidder, "Beaufort District—Past, Present, and Future," in *Continental Monthly* (New York and Boston, 1862-1864), I (1862), 383-84, 387; Gilbert Haven, "Camp Life at the Relay," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (Title varies, New York, 1850-), XXIV (1862), 629-30; "Our Map of South Carolina," in *Harper's Weekly*, V (1861), 741; "The Stars and Stripes in South Carolina," *ibid.*, 738; "Our Map of Port Royal, South Carolina, with the Surrounding Country," in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* (Title varies, New York, 1855-1922), XIII (1862), 6; "Our Cotton Campaign in South Carolina . . .," *ibid.*, 200-201, 206; "Alleghania," *ibid.*, 243; "The Capture of New Orleans," *ibid.*, XIV (1862), 43; "Baton Rouge, Louisiana," *ibid.*, 84-85.

Yankees to enter and make a paradise of this magnificent region! . . . It is the land of the palm and banana—the orange and the lemon. Its capacities are without limit.”¹¹ Another exclaimed, “Men—Ideas—Loyalty—are needed . . . It is the true El Dorado of the times.”¹² In New England, a vigorous group made up of scholars like Charles Eliot Norton of Harvard, veteran reformers such as Samuel G. Ward, and aggressive business men typified by “the railroad builder,” John Murray Forbes, and the cotton manufacturer, Edward Atkinson, organized the New England Loyal Publication Society. Through it they undertook to provide “information” on wartime problems through the medium of original articles and reprints from the metropolitan press, all published on broadsides, and sent to hundreds of northern daily and weekly newspapers.¹³ Among the large number of topics with which they dealt, there was one series of releases on “The Resources of the South.”¹⁴

Granted that many of these New England leaders were anxious to use the war to accomplish the South’s rebuilding, it is just as evident that some northern business men hoped to reclaim lucrative by-products from such an enterprise. An enumeration of these gains would include: investment opportunities for war-created surplus capital, a firmly established protective tariff based on southern as well as northern advocacy, quicker and more exclusive access to stocks of raw materials in the South, a productive though cheaply paid southern labor supply, and expanded markets for northern merchandise.

Even while many of the fiercest battles remained to be fought, the border states and occupied territory of the South were magnets of interest for the more adventurous northern investors. As an instance,

¹¹ “‘H. A.’ to the Editors of the Wisconsin State Journal, November 12, 1863,” in [Madison] *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 25, 1863.

¹² “‘X’ to the Editors of the Wisconsin State Journal, November 29, 1863,” *ibid.*, December 17, 1863.

¹³ For the Society’s organization and methods, see Sara Norton and M. A. de Wolfe Howe (eds.), *Letters of Charles Eliot Norton*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1913), I, 222-23, 259-60; Sarah Forbes Hughes (ed.), *Letters and Recollections of John Murray Forbes*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1900), I, 324-29; Edith E. Ware, “Committees of Public Information, 1863-1866,” in *The Historical Outlook* (Title varies, Philadelphia, 1909-), X (1919), 65-67.

¹⁴ *New England Loyal Publication Society Broad-sides*, Nos. 106, 110, 114, 131 [August 24, September 2, September 11, October 22, 1863].

when George M. Barry, a Bostonian, visited Western Virginia in June, 1862, he reported that northern corporations and individuals were taking the first steps toward the introduction of Yankee industry into the South. Wheeling, he noticed, had eight foundries which were, "as a matter of course," owned by eastern men, "and doing an excellent business."¹⁵ Had he written in 1864 he might have observed further that there was in that year a renewed craze for oil speculation which, before long, spread into Eastern Kentucky.¹⁶ Although Tennessee had no such boom as this, Yankee-owned manufactories of beer, ale, cigars, and the like sprang up rapidly once Federal troops had moved into its cities.¹⁷ From New York lawyers came an inquiry to Governor Andrew Johnson concerning the powers of a northern corporation to mine saltpetre in Tennessee; and a few days later there was a different request for aid with respect to coal mining property.¹⁸

Hopes for developing the South's mineral resources well suited the designs of northern high-tariff advocates. Their foremost spokesman, Henry C. Carey, averred that the war then raging was "but a legitimate child of . . . the British free trade system," which had fostered plantation society in the South. He directed attention to "a great free soil wedge" which extended down the backbone of the mountains that separated the lowlands of the Atlantic slope from the Mississippi Valley. The population of those southern highlands would need to increase

¹⁵ George M. Barry to Amos A. Lawrence, June 23, 1862, Lawrence Papers, XXIII (Massachusetts Historical Society Library, Boston).

¹⁶ William C. Stiles to Jay Cooke, June 8, 1864, Cooke Papers; Jacob R. Dodge, *West Virginia: Its Farms and Forests, Mines and Oil Wells* (Philadelphia, 1865), 220, 225-26, 250-55, 257, 260-63; Charles G. Leland, *Memoirs* (New York, 1893), 295-302; Philadelphia Press, December 5, 1864, cited in James M. Callahan, *History of West Virginia* . . . , 3 vols. (Chicago, 1923), I, 392-98; Charles H. Ambler, *West Virginia, The Mountain State* (New York, 1940), 421; Festus P. Summers, *Johnson Newlon Camden* (New York, 1937), 115-17; E. Merton Coulter, *The Civil War and Readjustment in Kentucky* (Chapel Hill, 1926), 368-69.

¹⁷ H. V. Burr to J. W. Tomeny, October 28, 1864, Second Agency, Memphis District, Correspondence Received by Assistant Special Agent (A-Z), Treasury Department Archives (The National Archives); Elias J. Johnson to T. H. Yeatman, February 17, 1864, *ibid.*; William Leemuller & Co. [?] to *id.*, February 17, 1864, *ibid.*

¹⁸ William Ware Peck to Andrew Johnson, March 3, 1862, Johnson Papers, XVI (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); R. J. Meigs to *id.* (telegram), March 6, 1862, *ibid.*; Cf. Leonard Myers to *id.*, July 22, 1864, *ibid.*, XLV.

only slightly to enable it to seize control of southern policy, "and thus to bring the entire South into perfect harmony with the North and West." The southern hill country, "abounding in coal, salt, limestone, iron ore, gold and almost every other material required for the development of a varied industry," would have been filled with free northern men—miners, smelters, founders, and machinists—long before the outbreak of war, had not the South prevented the passage of a protective tariff.¹⁹ Now, wrote Carey in April, 1865, "Let us have a policy that shall fill the South with mills, furnaces, with shops and Northern men, and then the slave will become really free while his employer will become rich and their nation will become independent."²⁰

Elsewhere investment in southern lands followed close upon Union victories. Within two months after the occupation of the Sea Islands off the coast of South Carolina and Georgia, a Boston periodical was advocating that northern colonists be sent there to raise cotton.²¹ Taking up the suggestion, the New England Emigrant Aid Company, which had been "purged" of some of its more eccentric members since its intervention in "Bloody Kansas," issued a circular favoring mass emigration to the South.²² Practical if limited approval of such a program came from Congress, when, on June 7, 1862, it passed the direct tax law.²³ Acting under its provisions, President Lincoln, in September, 1862, issued instructions for the tax commissioners of South Carolina

¹⁹ Henry C. Carey, *The French and American Tariffs Compared; in a Series of Letters Addressed to Mons. Michel Chevalier* (Detroit, 1861), 19-20; Carey, *The Iron Question; Letters To the Hon. Schuyler Colfax* . . . [January 6, 1865] (Philadelphia, 1865), 9-12. Cf. D. G., "Great National Interests . . . Number V," in *Detroit Advertiser and Tribune*, January 7, 1864; "The Free Trade Policy of Great Britain," in *North American Review* (Boston, 1815-1940), XCV (1862), 496-97; William Elder, "Debt and Resources of the United States," in *The Bankers' Magazine and Statistical Register* (Title varies, New York, 1846-), New Series, XIII (1863), 289.

²⁰ Henry C. Carey to John Sherman, April 6, 1865, Sherman Papers, LVIII (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

²¹ [Charles G. Leland], "Editor's Table," in *Continental Monthly*, I (1862), 4 (foot-note); *First Annual Report of the Educational Commission For Freedmen* (Boston, 1863), 1-9.

²² "Circular by Directors of New England Emigrant Aid Society—June, 1862 . . .," Lawrence Papers, XXIII; Russell K. Hickman, "Speculative Activities of the Emigrant Aid Company," in *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (Topeka, 1931-), IV (1935), 265.

²³ James G. Randall, *Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln* (New York, 1926), 317-20.

to sell nearly twenty-five thousand acres of forfeited lands to highest bidders.²⁴

Amos A. Lawrence, a great Massachusetts cotton goods merchant and manufacturer, and a promoter of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, had a personal interest in these sales. When impatiently awaiting the beginning of the auctions, Lawrence wrote to a commissioner of "contrabands": "Give us the figures of population, valuation, territory occupied by our troops, etc. . . . I will pay \$100 for this preparatory work . . . Give us information about tax sales . . . when they will be . . . How much land!"²⁵

By April, 1863, a tax sale map submitted to Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase showed that relatively large quantities had been sold to northern buyers.²⁶ The largest of these was Edward S. Philbrick, Lawrence's neighbor in Brookline, Massachusetts, who had been assistant superintendent of the Boston and Worcester Railroad. Philbrick purchased the plantations on behalf of other Boston investors, and in the summer of 1863 he controlled about a dozen holdings.²⁷ Amos A. Lawrence's nephew, Dr. Frank W. Lawrence, was also in South Carolina, where he bought two six hundred and fifty acre plantations for the Lawrence interests.²⁸ Before he did so his uncle carefully advised him that "If the Govt. policy is to parcel out any large proportion of it to the negroes, then the value of the land will diminish. In Canada the value of R[eal] Est[ate] in their neighborhood has fallen off."²⁹ But Lawrence's fears were groundless; only a few of the South Carolina Negroes purchased lands, and the operations on his plantations were successful to the extent of a hundred per cent profit

²⁴ George W. Julian, *Speeches on Political Questions* [1850-1868] (New York, 1872), 227-28.

²⁵ Amos A. Lawrence to James Means, January 9, 1863 (Letter press copy), Lawrence Letterbooks, V (Massachusetts Historical Society Library, Boston).

²⁶ William H. Brisbane to Salmon P. Chase, April 24, 1863, Chase Papers, LXXIV (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

²⁷ *New England Loyal Publication Society Broadside*, No. 97 [August 1, 1863]; Bell I. Wiley, *Southern Negroes, 1861-1865* (New Haven, 1938), 199.

²⁸ Amos A. Lawrence to Giles Richards, March 12, 1864 (Letter press copy), Lawrence Letterbooks, V.

²⁹ *Id.* to Frank W. Lawrence, March 19, 1863 (Letter press copy), *ibid.*

on his investment in the first year.³⁰ While personally arranging for the sale of his own and neighbor Philbrick's cotton, the manufacturer noted: "I am desirous that this first crop produced by *free labor* shall bring a good price, besides having a personal pecuniary int[erest]."³¹ To his nephew he promised capital for any other ventures in land which the younger Lawrence might see fit to undertake.³² And, as if to prove that it was not a passing infatuation, a year later he reflected: "That land will never be worthless, whether South Carolina society be good or bad."³³ As for Philbrick, by "combining a fine humanity with honest sagacity and close calculation," he made in a single year a profit of \$80,000.³⁴

In the minds of some New England manufacturers both immediate profits and philanthropy were subordinated to the problem of an abundant supply of cotton. Propagandists easily formulated a solution which fitted well into the program of carpetbag imperialism. By the assumption of their premise, the limiting factor in southern production had been the inability of the slaveowners to breed slaves fast enough to meet the demand. Hence, the increased labor supply which would result from the influx of free laborers from the North would drive down labor costs, and increase the supply of the staple.³⁵ Edward Atkinson, the chief protagonist of "cheap cotton by free labor," estimated that in comparison with the slave a free man could produce twice the amount of cotton for the same cost.³⁶ And had he needed corroboration, Atkinson might well have gone to Samuel Hooper,

³⁰ *Id.* to N. E. Carpenter, January 11, 1864 (Letter press copy), *ibid.*

³¹ *Id.* to L. B. Bacon, February 25, 1864 (Letter press copy), *ibid.*

³² *Id.* to Frank W. Lawrence, December 31, 1863 (Letter press copy), *ibid.*

³³ *Id.* to *id.*, December 31, 1864 (Letter press copy), *ibid.*

³⁴ Edward L. Pierce, "The Freedmen at Port Royal," in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, 1857-), XII (1863), 308; Harold F. Williamson, *Edward Atkinson, The Biography of an American Liberal* (Boston, 1934), 11.

³⁵ *New England Loyal Publication Society Broad-sides*, Nos. 67, 91 [May 21?, July 17, 1863]; [Truman Smith], *Considerations on the Slavery Question Addressed to the President of the United States . . .* (New York, 1862), 10-12.

³⁶ [Edward Atkinson], "Taxation No Burden," in *Atlantic Monthly*, X (1862), 116. Cf. Amos E. Taylor, "Walker's Financial Mission to London on Behalf of the North, 1863-1864," in *Journal of Economic and Business History* (Cambridge, 1929-1932), III (1931), 315; Williamson, *Edward Atkinson*, 6-7.

Boston iron manufacturer and member of Congress, who was then employing about two hundred men in his iron rolling mill at South Boston. Hooper admitted: "It would be difficult to induce us to agree with them [the workers], instead of paying their wages, to support them with their families—in sickness or in health—the young and helpless, and the old and decrepit, as well as those who are able-bodied."³⁷

Some northern business men also were eager that the South should become a greater market for northern manufactured goods. This was not a new hope. Nearly thirty years before, abolitionist spellbinders had promised skeptical middle-class auditors that when freedom should succeed slavery in the South, wider and more stable markets would arise there.³⁸ Now, amid the uncertainties of war, the Beaufort *Free South* reiterated that if the slaves were free and independent laborers they would want all the articles of sale which had increased the North's living standards.³⁹ Writing to the editors of the Boston *Daily Advertiser* after fifteen months on the Sea Islands, Edward S. Philbrick testified that he could see an immense demand developing for "knick-knacks and household comforts of Yankee manufacture."

Nor was it strange that Philbrick's friend, Edward Atkinson, the New England industrialist, should carry this letter posthaste to the New England Loyal Publication Society for distribution throughout the North.⁴⁰ But the promise of better sales did not stop with the anticipated

³⁷ Samuel Hooper to Charles Sumner, April 26, May 5, 1863, Sumner Papers, LXIV. Cf. N. H. Eggleston, "Emancipation," in *New Englander*, XXI (1862), 799-807.

³⁸ Julian P. Bretz, "Economic Backgrounds of the Liberty Party," in *American Historical Review*, XXXIV (1929), 252-56.

³⁹ Beaufort (South Carolina) *Free South*, April 18, 1863, cited in *New England Loyal Publication Society Broadside*, No. 62 [May 10?, 1863].

⁴⁰ Edward Atkinson to Charles Eliot Norton, July 20, 1863, New England Loyal Publication Society Papers (Boston Public Library); "Edward S. Philbrick to the Editors of the Boston Daily Advertiser," in *Boston Daily Advertiser*, July 20, 1863; "A New Market for Manufactures," *New England Loyal Publication Society Broadside*, No. 95 [July 28, 1863]; "Henry Ward Beecher at the Academy of Music," in *Philadelphia Press*, December 14, 1863; "The Freed Men of South Carolina," in *New York Commercial Advertiser*, July 29, 1862; Governor John A. Andrew's annual message, cited in *New York World*, January 10, 1863; David A. Wells, *Our Burden and Our Strength* (New York, 1864), 34-35; Charles Nordhoff, *America for the Free Working Man . . . How Slavery Injures the Free Working Man . . .* (New York, 1865); Swint, *Northern Teacher in the South*, 32-33; Wiley, *Southern Negroes*, 234-35.

increase in the Negroes' purchasing power, since, considering the commonplace aspects of everyday life, it was confidently supposed that the Union armies would improve the outlook of the southern white population. One publicist remarked: "It is a notorious fact that few things are more surprising to the lower classes of the South—who constitute the great bulk of the population—than the rations which our soldiers are accustomed to receive."⁴¹ A different onlooker bore witness that the planters themselves lived in a style so poor that it would not be tolerated "by a fourth rate Pennsylvania farmer." If the planter could be freed from "the incubus of slavery," or if northern men could take over the plantations, there would be a new spirit of enterprise: "Where there is one decent and habitable house, a dozen will be needed, with the furniture and other things that belong to a decent house. In fact, there is scarcely a single article manufactured at the North which will not find a ready and profitable market at the South, and in addition to this . . . bankruptcy and repudiation may be considered among the things of the past."⁴²

Northern propagandists of a business man's Utopia usually assumed that a large influx of population would be necessary to reconstruct the South, and consequently not a few of them represented the area to be a haven for millions of European immigrants. Thus, William D. Kelley advised his audience in the House of Representatives to "Throw your eyes across the Atlantic and behold Europe swarming with oppressed, but restless and aspiring people. You see there the people and the ancestors of the people who are to occupy the South."⁴³ A few bold opportunists undertook to induce foreign immigrants to enter the South. Robert J. Walker, former secretary of the treasury, identified himself with projects to attract Europeans for settlement in the western

⁴¹ "The War as Regenerative of the South," in *New York Times*, December 5, 1863. Cf. George L. Stearns to Andrew Johnson, January 2, 1864, Johnson Papers, XXXVIII; "Rejuvenation," in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, XIII (1861), 67.

⁴² Beaufort *Free South*, April 18, 1863, cited in *New England Loyal Publication Society Broadside*, No. 62 [May 10?, 1863]; *Detroit Advertiser and Tribune*, January 16, 1863.

⁴³ *Congressional Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 2080 (May 3, 1864). Cf. Frederick A. Conkling, *On the Production and Consumption of Cotton* (New York, 1865), 30; Gertrude de Vingut, "Our Unity as a Nation," in *New Englander*, XXI (1862), 111.

and southern states.⁴⁴ Within the North itself there was some evidence that German nationality groups were ready to co-operate in analogous efforts. German citizens residing in Washington who were for the most part employed in the government departments, formed an emigrant association and purchased land across the Potomac for an experimental farm. Their organization became a model for about forty similar associations among Germans of the North. Each group hoped to be the nucleus of a colony which should eventually establish itself in the South.⁴⁵

To northern employers, the attempts to encourage immigration were quite welcome. Faced as they were with a serious labor shortage, northern industrialists were eager to enlarge the stream of wartime immigration.⁴⁶ Apparently to calm the fears of native-born workmen, civic groups representing the employers' point of view took great pains to explain that the postwar development of the country's resources would prevent any oversupply of labor. A special committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce declared that with the return of peace "and the re-establishment of open communication with the States of the South . . . the restoration of vast tracts of fertile land to the use of the husbandman will call many laborers into the field."⁴⁷ Since the South

⁴⁴ "'Citizen' to the Editor of the New York Times," in *New York Times*, September 6, 1863; "Important from Washington . . . Labor Wanted," in *New York Commercial Advertiser*, September 19, 1862.

⁴⁵ "Letter from the Federal Capital . . . Land Association—Germans," in *Milwaukee Sentinel*, January 1, 1864; George O. Glavis to Andrew Johnson, January 28, 1865, Johnson Papers, LVI; Lester J. Cappon, "The Yankee Press in Virginia, 1861-1865," in *William and Mary College Historical Magazine* (Williamsburg, 1892-), Second Series, XV (1935), 82.

⁴⁶ A. J. Perkins, *Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Philadelphia Board of Trade . . . February 6, 1865* (Philadelphia, 1865), 91-92; Emerson D. Fite, *Social and Industrial Conditions in the North During the Civil War* (New York, 1930), 190-96; Fred A. Shannon, *America's Economic Growth* (New York, 1940), 325; Daniel Creamer, "Recruiting Contract Labor for the Amoskeag Mills," in *Journal of Economic History* (New York, 1941-), I (1941), 43.

⁴⁷ *Report of Emigration by a Special Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, January 5 1865 . . .* (New York, 1865), 9-14; Union League Club of New York, *Report of the Special Committee on Emigration . . .* (New York, 1864), 17-18; "The Labor Question," in *United States Economist and Dry Goods Reporter* (New York), June 4, 1864.

was far more depleted than the North, its demand for laborers would be greater.⁴⁸

Transformation of the South by "free labor" received encouragement for still other reasons. Federal soldiers riding or trudging over the Southland wrote to their friends and relatives in the North of its future outlook. One promised that "the day will come when the busy hum of the factory and the mighty blows of the forge will be heard among the mountains."⁴⁹ A fellow-trooper saw "Mason and Dixon's line . . . obliterated from the map of our country."⁵⁰ And while Rutherford B. Hayes campaigned in Western Virginia, he surmised that Charleston "ought to be a sort of Pittsburgh" if that region became a "free State."⁵¹ Gleanings from diaries and letters bespoke their authors' intentions to revisit the South or to make it their permanent home after the war, and sometimes plantations were leased by ex-officers who had been discharged from the Union armies.⁵² Many who remained in service were eager for the privilege to "pre-empt" southern farms.⁵³

⁴⁸ "Immigration," in *Milwaukee Sentinel*, February 9, 1864.

⁴⁹ "The Proclamation of Emancipation," in *Philadelphia Press*, January 1, 1863. This is a printed extract from a letter of "an officer in a Maryland regiment," addressed to W. D. Kelley. It was dated at Williamsport, Maryland, November 27, 1862.

⁵⁰ Letter from the army, dated at Alexandria, Virginia, December 11, 1863, cited in *Racine Advocate*, December 23, 1863.

⁵¹ Charles R. Williams (ed.), *Diary and Letters of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 5 vols. (Columbus, Ohio, 1922-1926), II, 396 (Diary entry of March 23, 1863).

⁵² William Woodward to Elihu B. Washburne, December 28, 1863, Washburne Papers, XXXII (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); William H. Day to Andrew Johnson, January 17, 1864, Johnson Papers, XXXIX; F. C. Messinger to *id.*, June 18, 1864, *ibid.*, XLIV; "Another Letter from Memphis," in *The Presbyterian* (Title varies, Philadelphia, 1831-), XXXIII (1863), 81; Henry Hitchcock, *Marching with Sherman* (New Haven, 1927), 226; Frank K. Dunn (ed.), "Major [James Austin] Connally's Letters to His Wife, 1862-1865," in *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society*, (Springfield, 1906-1936), 1928, pp. 245, 264; R. Pierce Beaver, "An Ohio Farmer in Middle Tennessee in 1865," in *Tennessee Historical Magazine* (Nashville, 1915-1937), Second Series, I (1930), 29-39; Catherine B. Sherman (ed.), "A New England Boy [Henry Elijah Alvord] in the Civil War," in *New England Quarterly*, V (1932), 311, 318-19; Hans C. Heg to "Gunild," May 5, 1862, in Theodore C. Blegen (ed.), *Civil War Letters of Hans Christian Heg* (Northfield, Minnesota, 1936), 82; Tyler Dennett, *John Hay* (New York, 1933), 43-44, 46; Maude Carmichael, "Federal Experiments with Negro Labor on Abandoned Plantations in Arkansas, 1862-1865," in *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Fayetteville, 1942-), I (1942), 103; Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York, 1905), 322-23.

⁵³ T. R. Stanley to John Sherman, December 27, 1863, Sherman Papers, LXII; "Re-Settlement of the South," in *Milwaukee Sentinel*, February 2, 1864; Charles G. Leland,

Northern reactions to the soldiers' interest in the South were varied; sometimes they were fantastic. To illustrate, a newspaper writer who doubtless reflected the petty snobbery of the military martinet counselled that the privates should look forward to homesteads, colonels to "splendid farms," and generals to "magnificent plantations."⁵⁴ One other scheme of armed occupation, formulated by the erratic Eli Thayer, whose part in the "free labor" invasion of Kansas was still remembered, aroused much discussion and not a little commendation in the North.⁵⁵ In brief, he wished to send between ten and twenty thousand northern men to Florida either in Federal uniform or as a volunteer army. Together with the "Unionists" of Florida, they would reorganize the state as a political unit, and restore agriculture and commerce. In the same fashion, other expeditions might reclaim other portions of the South.⁵⁶

Alongside such a bizarre suggestion, more tangible recognitions of the veterans' sacrifices were commonplace. But some government officials saw the connection between southern economic rewards for the soldiers and the thorny problem of postwar veterans' demands.⁵⁷ Likewise, the compensation of Union troops "at the cost of the enemy" became a frequently reiterated theme in Congress.⁵⁸ By the spring of

"Desperation and Colonization," in *Continental Monthly*, I (1862), 661-62; Oscar Zeichner, "The Transition from Slave to Free Agricultural Labor in the Southern States," in *Agricultural History* (Chicago, 1927-), XIII (1939), 23.

⁵⁴ Cited in *Washington Daily Chronicle*, June 6, 1863.

⁵⁵ Marshall O. Roberts to Eli Thayer, October 2, 1862, Eli Thayer Papers (Brown University Library, Providence, Rhode Island); MS. petitions dated November 8, 24, December 5, 1862, *ibid.*; "News of the Day," in *New York Times*, December 29, 1862; "The Colonization of Florida," in *New York Evening Post*, February 9, 1863; Rice, *Life of Thayer*, Chapter 35; *Diary and Correspondence of Salmon P. Chase*, American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1902, II (Washington, 1903), 92; William W. Davis, *The Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida* (New York, 1913), 255-57.

⁵⁶ Eli Thayer to C. Edwards Lester, February [n. d.], 1863, cited in Rice, *Life of Thayer*, Chapter 35, pp. 10-12.

⁵⁷ W. P. Mellen to Benjamin F. Flanders, October 5, 1864, Third Special Agency Papers, Group C (A-N), Acc. 210 (Treasury Department Archives, The National Archives).

⁵⁸ *Congressional Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 Sess., 1032 (February 28, 1862); *ibid.*, 1920 (May 2, 1862); *ibid.*, 2196 (May 19, 1862); *ibid.*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 405 (January 28, 1864); *ibid.*, 2108, 2110, 2115 (May 4, 1864); *ibid.*, 2234 (May 11, 1864); *ibid.*, 2251 (May 12, 1864). Cf. "From Washington . . . Addresses before the Union League," in *New York Daily Tribune*, December 24, 1863.

1864, taxes for money bounties were mounting, inflation was cheapening the currency, and there was a challenging fear that the interest (to say nothing of the principal) on the North's war debt could never be paid in gold. It was then that Amos A. Lawrence, revealing the concern of others in the North, conceded: "... if the gov[ernmen]t can pay the troops in South[er]n land after the old fashion of warfare, then the debt may be kept down somewhat."⁵⁹ When he wrote, Congress had been for over four months considering legislation which provided eighty-acre homesteads for soldiers and sailors who had served two years.⁶⁰ Nor did the death of this proposal in a Senate committee put an end to all requests for "bounty lands in rebeldom." On the contrary, a partisan remarked in December, 1864, that if the war should be prolonged another year he thought "no power on earth could prevent" such a course.⁶¹

Interest in the confiscation and resettlement of plantations went far beyond the war veteran. Especially vocal was one group in the "free West" which declared in ringing terms that it would fight to create a southern society of yeoman farmers who would own and till their own farms. Directly following the ideas of George Henry Evans and other ante-bellum land reformers, these "agrarian radicals" urged such a solution of the southern dilemma in the name of the "free labor" farmers of the Old Northwest. For them, the South's malady was a manifestation of land monopoly. In this respect the eastern capitalist might be as great a menace as the southern plantation owner. Speaking in favor of land confiscation, Congressman George W. Julian of Indiana reminded that unless it were done, "the older order of things will be swept away, but . . . we shall have the grasping monopolist of the North, whose dominion over the freedmen and poor whites

⁵⁹ Amos A. Lawrence to R. M. Mason, May 26-27, 1864 (Letter press copy), Lawrence Letterbooks, V; *id.* to Henry Wilson, December 15, 1863 (Letter press copy), *ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Congressional Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 343 (January 26, 1864); *ibid.*, 874 (February 29, 1864); *ibid.*, 2279 (May 16, 1864). Cf. "Homesteads for Soldiers," in Milwaukee *Sentinel*, February 2, 1864; Roy M. Robbins, *Our Landed Heritage* . . . (Princeton, 1942), 211-12.

⁶¹ J. B. Bingham to Andrew Johnson, December 23, 1864, Johnson Papers, LIV. Cf. Benjamin F. Butler to Wendell Phillips, December 20, 1864, in *Private and Official Correspondence of General Benjamin F. Butler*, 5 vols. (Norwood, Mass., 1917), V, 401.

will be more galling than slavery itself."⁶² In the same tenor, the most aggressive "free labor" newspaper in Detroit prefaced its remarks on the subject with a scathing review of land monopoly in the British Isles and the antirent disturbances of the 1840's in New York. Then it approvingly cited a radical paper from Nashville which rhetorically asked: "If the Rothschilds, Barings, William B. Astor, and a dozen other millionaires were to combine to purchase a few Congressional districts in Middle Tennessee, would the people regard the step as a blessing or a curse? . . . Where a few men hold enormously large tracts of land . . . hundreds of other men must go without land."⁶³

George B. Cheever, old-time abolitionist, thought he saw the pattern of postwar reconstruction developing through the appointment of an agrarian radical like Andrew Johnson to the governorship of such a vital state as Tennessee.⁶⁴ What Cheever failed to notice was that the agrarian radicals' drastic policy of land division was incompatible with the capitalistic program of eastern business men. To take an illustration, in December, 1863, Boston capitalists were organizing for operations in the South a "free labor Cotton Company" with a capitalization of \$50,000. Far from undertaking to subdivide the southern plantations, such a corporation would act as an absentee owner with agents managing its investments.⁶⁵

One of the most significant reasons why the conflict of East and West did not develop into an open breach at the time was that many

⁶² *Congressional Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1187 (March 18, 1864). Cf. *ibid.*, 298-99 (January 21, 1864); F. D. Parish to John Sherman, February 14, 1863, Sherman Papers, LVII.

⁶³ "Land Monopoly under Slavery," in *Detroit Advertiser and Tribune*, June 6, 1863; "The Gold Fields of the South," in *Milwaukee Sentinel*, December 30, 1863; "A Radical Remedy," *ibid.*, January 15, 1864. For attitudes of "intellectual radicals," see: Francis Lieber, *Slavery, Plantations, and the Yeomanry* (Loyal Publications Society Pamphlet, No. 29, New York, 1863); Wendell Phillips to George W. Julian, March 19, [1864], Julian-Giddings Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁶⁴ George B. Cheever to Charles Sumner, March 2, 1862, Sumner Papers, LVII.

⁶⁵ Charles F. Fletcher to Salmon P. Chase, December 26, 1862, Chase Papers, LXIX (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Edward Atkinson to [Charles Eliot Norton], December 12, 1863, New England Loyal Publication Society Papers; S. S. Bucklin to Joseph Holt, March 18, 1862, Holt Papers, XXXII (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); D. G. Lang to Benjamin F. Flanders, December 14, 1863, Third Special Agency Papers, Group C (A-N); "Fabulous Profits of Cotton Growing," in *Philadelphia Press*, August 5, 1864; Williamson, *Edward Atkinson*, 279-82.

a northwestern investor favored the ideas of the eastern business men more than he did those of the land reformers. The value of Tennessee as a mineral producing section which would "glow with manufacturing" industry was just as appealing to business leaders of the Northwest as it was to New York capitalists.⁶⁶ Already in evidence was that curious dichotomy which later was to emerge as the conflict of the agrarian Middle West versus the industrial Middle West. Yankees from the Old Northwest were no less anxious than those of New England to find "a big thing" in plantation leases, or in building sawmills amid the southern pine forests.⁶⁷ In radical Union Leagues then springing up in the South, northern immigrants fraternized with those ex-slaveholders who were willing to pay their former bondsmen wages.⁶⁸ And if the treatment of the freedmen by northern plantation lessees can be accepted as a criterion, considerations of profit swept dogmatic idealism far into the background.⁶⁹

As the war drew to a close, it is doubtful whether many northern business men were much concerned with elaborate blueprints of the new South. To a far greater extent they were interested in ways by which southern wealth could aid northern economy in postwar read-

⁶⁶ "Hints to Emigrants—East Tennessee," in Quincy (Illinois) *Daily Whig and Republican*, December 7, 1863. Without acknowledgment, the Quincy newspaper quoted this article from a New England Loyal Publication Society broadside. See also, "Mechanics and the War," in Grand Rapids *Eagle*, cited in *ibid.*, December 3, 1863; "Raising Cotton," in Milwaukee *Sentinel*, December 15, 1863.

⁶⁷ Cassius Fairchild to "Sarah," May 25, 1863, Fairchild Papers, XV (State Historical Society of Wisconsin Library, Madison); E. J. Peck to Andrew Johnson, September 10, 1864, Johnson Papers, XLVIII; Willard S. Hickox to John Sherman, January 4, 1864, Sherman Papers, LXIII; William Cary to Elihu B. Washburne, January 24, 1864, Washburne Papers, XXXIV; J. W. Grimes to Gustavus V. Fox, August 13, 1862, in Robert M. Thompson and Richard Wainwright (eds.), *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox*, 2 vols. (New York, 1918-1919), II, 352-53.

⁶⁸ "Affairs in Tennessee . . . from Our Own Correspondent," in New York *Times*, September 6, 1863; Frederick Collins and Lloyd P. Smith, *Report to the Contributors to the Pennsylvania Relief Association for East Tennessee . . .* (Philadelphia, 1864), 22-23; "The Work of Reconstruction," in *Harper's Weekly*, VI (1862), 370.

⁶⁹ William Birney to Salmon P. Chase, April 25, 1864, Chase Papers, II (Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library); Thomas W. Conway to Benjamin F. Flanders, November 22, 1864, Third Special Agency Papers, Group C (A-N); James McKaye to Charles Sumner, January 20, 1864, Sumner Papers, LXVII; Wiley, *Southern Negroes*, especially 248-49.

justments. A most inspiring benefit they had come to anticipate was the large southern need for materials of peaceful living. Of necessity, the Northeast would be expected to supply great amounts of manufactured wood, cotton, and iron, while a mammoth flow of grain and pork would rush southward from the Old Northwest.⁷⁰ Furthermore, such a stagnation as Britain suffered after the Napoleonic wars would be impossible because of the exchange value in cotton, naval stores, and other southern raw materials which were locked within the Confederacy. These products would provide purchasing power, and it was the task of northern merchants to break down the obstacles to such a trade.⁷¹ In its eagerness to siphon off the wealth of the South, the New York Chamber of Commerce passed resolutions favoring the immediate removal of all restrictions on the southern trade.⁷²

Sanguine predictions went so far as to picture the northern financial system reconstructed by the influx of southern cotton. If the staple were

⁷⁰ "Business Prospects after the War," in *American Railroad Journal* (Title varies, New York, 1832-), XXXV (1862), 405; "The Situation," in *United States Economist and Dry Goods Reporter*, October 1, 1864; "New York Dry Goods Market," *ibid.*, December 24, 1864; "Yearly Statement of Titus, Smyth & Co.," cited in *Observer* (New York, 1823-1912), XLIII (1865), 23; "The Trade of Northern Missouri," in *Chicago Journal of Commerce*, January 12, 1865; *Iron Age*, cited in *ibid.*, April 13, 1865; "Finance and Trade," in *New York Shipping and Commercial List* (Title varies, New York, 1815-1926), L (1864), 319; "Prospects of the Hog Crop," *ibid.*, 343; "Editor's Work-Bench; Ten Days Abroad," in *New York Coach-Makers' Magazine* (New York, 1858-1871), VI (1864), 61; Lorenzo Sabine (ed.), "Review of the Boston Market for the Year 1864, furnished by Messrs. Learned, Thompson & Co. . . .," in *Boston Board of Trade, 1865; Eleventh Annual Report . . .* (Boston, 1865), 64; "Import of Dry Goods at the Port of New York for the Year 1865," in *Eighth Annual Report of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York* (New York, 1866), Part II, p. 77.

⁷¹ "Annual Review of the Naval Stores Trade for the Year 1865," in *Eighth Annual Report of New York Chamber of Commerce*, Part II, p. 85; "Eastern Cotton," in *United States Economist and Dry Goods Reporter*, May 28, 1864; "The Cotton Supply," *ibid.*, July 23, 1864; "The Campaign in the Cotton States," *ibid.*, October 1, 1864; "Statistics of Trade and Commerce," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, LII (1865), 394-95; "Sugar Trade of the United States," in *New York Shipping and Commercial List*, L (1864), 160; "Cotton in Texas," *ibid.*, 299; "Stock Exchange and Money Market," in *American Railroad Journal*, XXXVIII (1865), 25-26; Conkling, *On the Production and Consumption of Cotton*, 15.

⁷² "Commercial Intercourse," in Danville (Virginia) *Daily Sixth Corps*, May 10, 1865. Cf. "Restrictions upon Cotton Traffic South," in *New York Shipping and Commercial List*, L (1864), 375; "The Ways of Peace," *ibid.*, LI (1865), 139; "Commercial Chronicle and Financial Review," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, LIII (1865), 43-44.

sent to English manufacturers it would be a remittance in kind on which English creditors' bills could be drawn. The premium on foreign exchange would fall, and possibly there would be a reversal of the outward flow of gold from the United States. Specie payments might then be resumed, and this the more easily because the South would be helping to absorb some of the excessive greenback issues.⁷³ Northern cotton spinners, of course, disagreed with the view that southern cotton should be sent abroad. Control of the cotton supply in the postwar years would be just as effective as the tariff in the world-wide race for markets in cotton goods.⁷⁴

Apart from the immediate desires of dissident northern business men were the older demands of northern creditors who wanted satisfaction of debt obligations denied to them in 1860 and succeeding years. On their behalf, a committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce submitted a surprising report which urgently asked the Federal government to refrain from the indiscriminate confiscation of southern cotton. If it were confiscated, the report explained, the proceeds very likely would be retained by the government instead of being surrendered to loyal northern creditors.⁷⁵ Similarly, there was concern over the public debts of the Confederate and Federal governments.⁷⁶

⁷³ Amasa Walker, "Peace, Prices, and Prospects," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, LII (1865), 182; "Stock Exchange and Money Market," in *American Railroad Journal*, XXXVII (1864), 338, 986, 1273; *ibid.*, XXXVIII (1865), 73-74, 169, 265, 290; *New York Business Mirror*, cited in *Chicago Journal of Commerce*, April 27, 1865; "Weekly Review of the Chicago Markets; Finance and Trade," *ibid.*, February 23, 1865; "The Cotton Supply Question," in *New York Shipping and Commercial List*, LI (1865), 73.

⁷⁴ "Current Events," in *New York Shipping and Commercial List*, LI (1865), 79; Lorenzo Sabine, "Cotton," in *Boston Board of Trade, 1866; Twelfth Annual Report . . .* (Boston, 1866), 18; Edward Atkinson to Henry C. Carey, July 28, 1864, Carey Papers; W. G. Burt to John A. Andrew, September 9, 1864, Andrew Papers, XXVI (Massachusetts Historical Society Library); Williamson, *Edward Atkinson*, 13-24.

⁷⁵ *Report of the Special Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on the Confiscation of Cotton in the Southern States by the Government . . .* (New York, 1865), 157-59. Cf. Lorenzo Sabine, "Protection of Loyal Creditors in Cases of Confiscation," in *Eleventh Annual Report of the Boston Board of Trade*, 15-16; "Captured Cotton," in *New York Shipping and Commercial List*, LI (1865), 15; "The Savannah Cotton Again," *ibid.*, 47; "The Seizure of Cotton," *ibid.*, 71; "Captured Cotton Once More," *ibid.*, 135.

⁷⁶ Charles F. Fletcher to Salmon P. Chase, December 26, 1862, Chase Papers; "Stock Exchange and Money Market," in *American Railroad Journal*, XXXVII (1864), 98;

Most conservative of all the motives governing attitudes toward the South was a dread of anarchy. If, admonished the New York Chamber of Commerce's special committee on southern cotton, the Federal government tried to confiscate the southern people's possessions, it would "almost inevitably, in the present condition of affairs, impel the inhabitants of those States to destroy their property, or, at least, to permit its destruction by the rebel soldiery."⁷⁷ Acquisition of the southern lands by "free labor" immigrants could come just as easily by legal means of foreclosure, and through land sales arising from economic necessity.⁷⁸

Unmistakably, before that, southern refugees flocking into northern army camps and border cities had given a foretaste of the dangers which social dislocation might entail.⁷⁹ Early efforts to care for the freedmen were undertaken, at least in part, because of fear that thousands of Negroes might otherwise become "lawless hordes preying upon all."⁸⁰ So, too, insistence upon the proper education of southern Negroes was coupled with suggestions that its blessings should extend to the poor whites. As Benjamin Foster, assistant adjutant general in

Francis Lieber, *A Letter to Hon. E. D. Morgan . . . on the Amendment of the Constitution Abolishing Slavery . . .* (New York, 1865), 4; "Special Meeting, Friday, April 25th, 1862, Proceedings of the Chamber of Commerce, for the Year 1862," in *Fifth Annual Report of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York for the Year 1862-'63* (New York, 1863), 30-35.

⁷⁷ *Report of the Special Committee on the Confiscation of Cotton*, 159-60. Cf. "The Cleveland Convention," in *The New Nation* (New York), June 11, 1864.

⁷⁸ [Edward Atkinson], "The Future Supply of Cotton," in *North American Review*, XCVIII (1864), 495.

⁷⁹ [Jacob G. Forman], *The Western Sanitary Commission: A Sketch of Its Origin, History, Labors for the Sick and Wounded of the Western Armies . . .* (St. Louis, 1864), 125-28; *Report of the Western Sanitary Commission on the White Union Refugees of the South . . .* (St. Louis, 1864), *passim*; "Rebels in Southern Indiana," in *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, July 28, 1864; Arthur C. Cole, *The Era of the Civil War, 1848-1870* (Springfield, Illinois, 1919), 334-35.

⁸⁰ [G. W. Curtis], "For the Contrabands," in *Harper's Weekly*, VI (1862), 18; "Report of the Committee on Teachers," in *First Annual Report of the Educational Commission for Freedmen* (Boston, 1863), 10-11, 15; "The New-England Freedmen's Aid Society," in *The Freedmen's Journal* (Vol. I, No. 1, as *The Freedmen's Journal*, after that *The Freedmen's Record*, Boston, 1865-1873), I (1865), 1; "From Maryland," *ibid.*, 22; John W. Edmonds, "What Shall We Do With It?" in *Continental Monthly*, I (1862), 495; *Second Annual Report of the New England Freedmen's Aid Society* (Boston, 1864), 36.

North Carolina, demonstrated, there were thousands of poor white children "growing up in vice and ignorance," and unless they were "properly instructed," the "American people" would "have no guarantee that they will not in the future attempt to revolutionize the Government and destroy its noble institutions."⁸¹ Also to George Luther Stearns, the Boston lead manufacturer who proudly remembered that he once had supplied John Brown with arms, a widely different bourgeois spirit of conciliation now dictated a fear of revolutionary cataclysm in the postwar South. Having experienced uncertainty as a plantation lessee in 1864, he commanded the South to "conform your opinions and usages to those [of] countries where labor and capital is [*sic*] abundant. . . . The ballot box and the school is [*sic*] the security for capital in the Northern States, and must become so in the South."⁸² For that matter the Boston *Traveller* hastened to mention that compromise was not inconsistent even with military occupation. If the North meant to hold the southern states as the English held Ireland, or as the continental powers controlled Poland, Venetia, and Hungary, it must make concessions to a portion of the white population before it could in safety occupy the country with permanent garrisons or a standing army.⁸³ Carpetbag imperialism might require compromise with a type of southern leader.

There was a noteworthy divergence between the prevailing willingness of businessmen to gain their ends through realistic means, and the passion of radical Republican-Union politicians for thoroughgoing

⁸¹ *Second Annual Report of the New England Freedmen's Aid Society*, 32; "The German Radicals . . . Popular Education in the South . . .," in *Chicago Tribune*, October 31, 1863; "A New Benevolent Enterprise," in Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, July 21, 1864; Lyman Abbott, "Southern Evangelization," in *New Englander*, XXIII (1864), 705; Benjamin B. Foster, "General Orders No. 32," March 11, 1864, in *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. XXXIII, p. 668; Howard K. Beale (ed.), *The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866*, American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1930, IV (Washington, 1933), 347-48 (Diary entry of March 19, 1864).

⁸² George L. Stearns to E. C. Cabell, September 29, 1865, cited in *The Right Way* (Boston), November 25, 1865.

⁸³ "General Banks and the Louisiana Sugar Planters," in Boston *Traveller*, cited in Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, March 10, 1863.

destruction of southern society.⁸⁴ Few northern industrialists would deny that they had suffered from southern policies in ante-bellum government, and they were determined not to submit again to such domination. Neither would they permit "two hostile systems" to flourish between the Lakes and the Gulf.⁸⁵ Still, in the early summer of 1865, Amos A. Lawrence perhaps best summarized their opinions when, in refusing to attend an "indignation meeting" of radicals on the reconstruction problem, he noted: "The Government is best informed on the subject, and we may trust Mr. Johnson and the Cabinet not to permit the re-organizing of State governments too suddenly."⁸⁶ If the politicians were to draw any solace from such an attitude it would have been well for them to remember that, in the spirit of the times, opportunism was a virtue.

⁸⁴ Henry Winter Davis to Edward McPherson, May 27, 1865, McPherson Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Wendell Phillips to George W. Julian, March 27, [1865], Julian-Giddings Papers; Thomas F. Woodley, *Great Leveler, The Life of Thaddeus Stevens* (New York, 1937), 351-52, 354; James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*, 2 vols. (Norwich, Connecticut, 1884-1886), II, 192; "Justice for Seceded States," in *Chicago Tribune*, December 19, 1863; "Who Prolongs the War?" in *Philadelphia North American and United States Gazette*, December 7, 1863; William C. Grosvenor, "The Law of Conquest the True Basis of Reconstruction," in *New Englander*, XXIV (1865), 111-31. For the opinion of a prominent literary figure who was close to the radical politicians of Massachusetts, see Edward Waldo Emerson and Waldo Emerson Forbes (eds.), *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 10 vols. (Boston, 1909-1914), X, 93-94 (Journal entry of April 10, 1865).

⁸⁵ "Stock Exchange and Money Market," in *American Railroad Journal*, XXXVII (1864), 1225; "Comprehensiveness of Emancipation," in *New York Daily Tribune*, December 26, 1863; Walker, *Peace, Prices, and Prospects*, 181; A. J. Perkins, *Thirty-Third Annual Report of the Philadelphia Board of Trade . . . February 5, 1866* (Philadelphia, 1866), 10; *Iron Age*, cited in *Chicago Journal of Commerce*, April 20, 1865; A. A. Low [Inaugural address as President of the New York Chamber of Commerce], "Annual Meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, XLVIII (1863), 454; *The Preservation of the Union, a National Economic Necessity* (Loyal Publication Society Pamphlet, No. 14, New York, 1863), 5-6.

⁸⁶ Amos A. Lawrence Diary (Massachusetts Historical Society Library), Diary K (entry of June 26, 1865). Cf. "Annual Meeting, Thursday, May 4, 1865, Proceedings of the Chamber of Commerce from May, 1865, to May, 1866," in *Eighth Annual Report of the New York Chamber of Commerce* (New York, 1866), Part I, p. 4; Charles P. Kirkland, "The Restoration of the Rebel States to the Union," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, LIII (1865), 29-30; William B. Hesseltine, "Economic Factors in the Abandonment of Reconstruction," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), XXII (1935), 192.

A Chapter of Panton, Leslie and Company

BY ROBERT S. COTTERILL

Perhaps no land speculation in our history is better known than that of the Forbes Purchase in Florida; certainly none has given rise to more litigation or has more often taken up the time of the courts. The Forbes Purchase, however, was but a minor incident in a huge effort to collect from the southern Indians the trading debts which they had contracted to Panton, Leslie and Company, the famous British firm which dominated the Indian trade in the Floridas and adjoining areas during the closing years of the eighteenth century. This collection campaign was long and persistent, and in its final ten years it had the co-operation of the United States government. It became involved in the Mississippi question, the West Florida controversy, and the War of 1812. It contributed to the final downfall of that notorious adventurer, William Augustus Bowles, and for a time claimed the participation of the even more notorious James Wilkinson. It is a thread running through southern history from 1794 to 1812 and touching in its course foreign policy, Indian administration, frontier defense, and private intrigue.

The debts of the southern Indians to Panton, Leslie and Company began accumulating the day the firm began business, but William Panton does not seem to have worried much about them until 1794. Then he learned from President Washington's message of December 3, 1793, that the United States was contemplating the establishment of government trading posts among the Indians on a non-profit basis; and he concluded—quite erroneously—that his firm would be unable to meet such competition.¹ This prospective loss of business was all the

¹ Panton, Leslie and Company to Baron de Carondelet, May 2, 1794, in Duvon C. Corbitt (ed.), "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," *Georgia*

more serious to Pantón because of the losses he had incurred in 1792 when Bowles had plundered the Pantón, Leslie and Company store at St. Marks and inflicted damage to the extent of \$14,000.² In 1795 Pantón received a double blow when the United States proceeded actually to establish its first trading posts at Tellico and Colerain, and Spain agreed to the treaty of San Lorenzo placing all the southern Indians, except those of Florida, under the control of the United States, from whom his firm could expect nothing but opposition.

Under these circumstances Pantón, facing the apparent doom of his great trading business, began to take steps for the collection of the huge debts owing to his firm by the Indians. His first measure was taken in October, 1796, when he sent his junior partner, John Forbes, to Knoxville to confer with the United States officials at the trading post in an effort to secure some adjustment of the Cherokee debts.³ What "adjustment" Forbes had in mind may be inferred from the fact that the next spring (1797) John McKee, who had been Cherokee agent in 1796, was sent to Pensacola by the War Department to confer with Pantón and while there gave Pantón official assurance that the United States would "facilitate the effectual and prompt collection of their debts within our Indian nations."⁴ Subsequent events make clear that what Pantón wanted and what McKee promised in the name of his govern-

Historical Quarterly (Savannah, 1917-), XXIV (1940), 150-53. In this letter the Company proposed to Carondelet that Spain buy them out for \$400,000 or make them a loan of that sum for ten years without interest. Governor Vicente Folch recommended that they be given the loan, but no action was taken. See Sebastian de Casa Calvo to Mariano Luis de Urquijo, October 8, 1800, in Joseph M. White (comp.), *A New Collection of Laws, Charters and Local Ordinances of the Governments of Great Britain, France and Spain, Relating to the Concessions of Land in Their Respective Colonies . . .*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1839), II, 323-37.

² Lawrence Kinnaird, "The Significance of William Augustus Bowles' Seizure of Pantón's Apalachee Store in 1792," in *Florida Historical Quarterly* (Jacksonville, 1908-), IX (1931), 156-92.

³ John Forbes to Carondelet, July 22, 1796, in Corbitt (ed.), "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier," *loc. cit.*, XXIV, 266-67.

⁴ Henry Dearborn to William C. C. Claiborne, June 11, 1802, in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *The Mississippi Territorial Archives, 1798-1803*, 1 vol. published (Nashville, 1905), I, 484-85. A manuscript copy of this letter is in Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book A, 226-27. McKee visited Andrew Ellicott at Natchez in March on his way to Florida, and his conversation with Ellicott was of such a character as to arouse suspicion that he (McKee) was involved in the Blount conspiracy.

ment was that Panton, Leslie and Company might take land cessions from the southern Indians in payment of the debts. It is not to be supposed that the United States gave such a promise without obtaining something in return. At this time the Spaniards were delaying the surrender of the territory they had yielded at San Lorenzo and the United States was meditating their expulsion by force. It seems reasonable to suppose that the *quid pro quo* at Pensacola was a promise by Panton to keep the southern Indians quiet in the anticipated struggle.⁵ If any such agreement was made, it came to nothing, since the Spaniards withdrew their forces the next year and the crisis passed.

Panton did not discard the idea of land cessions, however, and in February, 1799, obtained assurances from Governor Manuel Gayoso de Lemos that Spain would not object to Panton, Leslie and Company's receiving land cessions from Indians within the limits of the United States.⁶ Panton, however, was unable to make any immediate progress in securing such cessions because of the unrest of the Indians over the marking of the Spanish-American line, and a further delay threatened in 1800 when the resurgent Bowles again landed in Florida and led a band of Creeks and Seminoles to destroy the company store at St. Marks, causing a further loss of \$16,054.⁷ This act of vandalism, however, eventually proved an advantage, for the aroused Panton cut off the Creek and Seminole trade until they should make compensation. The Indians soon yielded and before the year was out notified Panton that they were willing to make him a grant of land on the Ocklocknee. This being refused they offered one on the Apalachicola and this Panton agreed to accept.⁸

⁵ Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question, 1795-1803* (New York, 1934), 125-26. Whitaker suggested that Panton, because of his exasperation with the Spaniards over the treaty of San Lorenzo, promised to influence the Indians to aid the United States against Spain.

⁶ *American State Papers, Public Lands*, 8 vols. (Washington, 1832-1861), IV, 159. It is not clear whether the phrase "within the limits of the United States" refers to land or Indians.

⁷ William Panton to Manuel Gayoso de Lemos, May 12, 1799, in Corbitt (ed.), "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier," *loc. cit.*, XXV (1941), 162; *American State Papers, Public Lands*, IV, 161-62.

⁸ Gayoso de Lemos to John Forbes, February 4, 1801, in Corbitt (ed.), "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier," *loc. cit.*, XXV, 171; "A Journal of John Forbes, May, 1803," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, IX, 279-89.

Panton died at sea on March 26, 1801, and John Forbes now became the head of the firm.⁹ Forbes was quite as persistent as Panton in debt collecting. Since the presence of Bowles among the Seminoles kept the Creeks in an uproar and made it impossible to go on with the Florida grant, he began pressing for grants from the Choctaws and Chickasaws. Both tribes indicated a willingness to make the grants. Forbes then conferred with John McKee who had been serving as Choctaw agent since 1799 and who was now on the point of being superseded by Silas Dinsmore. In May, 1802, McKee wrote to Secretary of War Henry Dearborn that Panton, Leslie and Company were proposing to take a land cession from the Choctaws in payment of their debts, provided the government of the United States would sanction the measure. McKee urged that the sanction be given, since the government in 1797 had given them the assurance through him. This letter from McKee apparently brought the first information that Dearborn had ever received concerning this promise made by his Federalist predecessor. He wrote at once to William C. C. Claiborne, the governor of Mississippi Territory and ex-officio superintendent of Indian affairs among the Choctaws and Chickasaws, saying that McKee's promise had been unauthorized, that it could not be considered binding, and that foreigners could not be permitted to possess a large tract of land among the Indian nations. After this vigorous repudiation Dearborn concluded by saying that although the United States was under no obligation to indemnify any person who carried on trade within its limits, the government was willing for the debts to be paid and that if a tract on the Alabama and Tombigbee rivers could be secured, Congress might take the cession and pay the debts.¹⁰

This attitude of indifference on the part of the United States underwent a quick change in the fall of 1802 when the news reached Washington that Spain had withdrawn the right of deposit at New Orleans

⁹ Marie Taylor Greenslade, "John Innerarity, 1783-1854," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, IX, 90-95. The name of the firm was unchanged until 1804, when it became John Forbes and Company. In that year the Spanish government confirmed to John Forbes and Company all the privileges enjoyed by its predecessor.

¹⁰ Dearborn to Claiborne, June 11, 1802, in Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Territorial Archives*, I, 484-85.

and had retroceded Louisiana to France. President Jefferson judged—naturally and not altogether wrongly—that the United States was now to be confronted by a hostile power beyond the Mississippi. Under the circumstances he considered it essential that the United States should strengthen its hold on the east bank of the Mississippi and since this east bank was almost wholly in the hands of the Indians, it would be necessary to secure land cessions from them as rapidly as possible.¹¹ In the South this program would affect particularly the Choctaws and Chickasaws who between them possessed the Mississippi littoral from the mouth of the Yazoo to the mouth of the Ohio. The prospect of alienating the territory of these two tribes, traditionally friendly to the United States and traditionally averse to ceding land, did not cause Jefferson any distress because he was convinced that all the Indian tribes had more land than they needed and he had already evolved a plan for relieving them of their excess patrimony. This plan was to increase the government trading posts among them, get the Indians in debt, and then take land cessions in payment.¹² What had originally been designed as an agency of civilization he would utilize as an instrument of dispossession; he had, in fact, already so utilized it in securing a Creek cession on the Oconee in June, 1802. But the Choctaw and Chickasaw lands on the Mississippi were of vast extent, their debts at the trading posts were negligible, and the emergency was too great to

¹¹ James D. Richardson (comp.), *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, 10 vols. (Washington, 1896-1899), I, 353; *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1832-1834), I, 684-85.

¹² Jefferson in 1802 wrote: "The method by which we may advance to our object is to establish among the Chickasaws a factory for furnishing them all the necessaries and comforts they may wish (spirituous liquors excepted), encouraging them and especially their leading men to run in debt for these beyond their individual means of paying; and whenever in that situation they will always cede lands to rid themselves of debt," Quoted in Samuel C. Williams, *The Beginnings of West Tennessee, in the Land of the Chickasaws* (Johnson City, Tennessee, 1930), 62, note 7.

This plan of Jefferson's was freely expressed, as is shown by the following: "Mr. Hoccker [Hocker] told . . . that when he was at the Norard that in conversation with Mr. Jefferson he asked him if he could git the Cherokees to run in debt to the amount of ten or twelve thousand dollars in the publick store. Mr. Hoccker told him for answer fifty thousand. Well, says he, that is the way I intend to git there cuntrey for to git them to run in debt to the publick store and they will have to give there Land for payment." John Riley to Return J. Meigs, November 29, 1806, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Retired Classified Files.

allow time for the requisite increase of obligations. In this situation it must have seemed providential to Jefferson to find the Panton, Leslie and Company debts ready at hand for immediate use.

The only difficulty was that the cessions which the Choctaws and Chickasaws were willing to make were not the lands that Jefferson wanted. The Choctaws were offering territory in the forks of the Alabama and Tombigbee; the Chickasaws, between the Duck and Elk rivers. Their preference for selling these tracts is understandable, since in both regions the title was in dispute, the Creeks claiming one and the Cherokees the other. The Indians quite well understood the advantage of paying their debts with the property of other people. The Secretary of War took up the task of securing the Mississippi cessions and sent James Robertson to the Chickasaws in the winter of 1802. Robertson conferred with George Colbert and found that the agents of Forbes had been among the Chickasaws urging a cession of their land along Chickasaw Bluffs, but that the Chickasaws were not willing to sell any lands except those between the Duck and the Elk.¹³ For advancing the Choctaw cession Dearborn called on the persuasive powers of James Wilkinson, who was in Mississippi Territory in 1803 in the double capacity of commander of the United States forces and commissioner for running the line of the Choctaw cession of 1802. He was advised that the Choctaws were to be permitted to pay their Panton, Leslie and Company debt by a cession of their Mississippi River front to the United States and it was suggested to him that it would be to Forbes' advantage to contribute to this happy result by exerting over the Choctaws the influence which a creditor might be naturally expected to have over a debtor.¹⁴ This suggestion was conveyed to Forbes, who was at the time receiving similar overtures from Benjamin Hawkins solicit-

¹³ James Robertson to Meigs, December 18, 1802, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Retired Classified Files.

¹⁴ Dearborn to James Wilkinson, February 21, 1803, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book A, 326-27; *id.* to *id.*, April 16, 1803, in Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, 11 vols. to date (Washington, 1934-), V, *Mississippi Territory* (1937), 212. As a commissioner Wilkinson had heard Homostubby, a Choctaw chief, declare in a speech in October, 1802, that the Choctaws wished to sell the forks of the Alabama and Tombigbee to pay their debts. Report of October 10, 1802, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Retired Classified Files.

ing his influence with the Creeks to secure a cession on the Ocmulgee to the United States, the Creek debt to Panton, Leslie and Company to be paid out of the purchase money. The result was that Forbes sent his agent, William Simpson, to meet Wilkinson while he himself went among the Creeks, where his chief debts were.

Simpson met Wilkinson on the Chickasawhay River in August, 1803. Wilkinson reminded him that practically the entire trade of his Company was within the United States and "if they calculated on future indulgence it became absolutely necessary for their House to consult the interests and dispositions of our government." Simpson declared himself satisfied with this. Wilkinson observed that the United States had no objections to the Choctaws paying their Panton, Leslie and Company debts with the money received from a land cession to the United States "it being a leading feature of our policy to inculcate and to cherish a sense of moral obligations and distinctions among our Indians." The Indians, however, wanted to make a cession in the forks of the Alabama and Tombigbee while the United States wanted a cession on the Mississippi, and it was therefore Forbes' duty to see to it that the United States got what it wanted. Simpson pledged his firm to this program, and Wilkinson gave him a letter to Dinsmore so that he might call the Choctaws together and begin his persuasion. Wilkinson asked Dinsmore to "co-operate with Simpson in obtaining the Mississippi cession because the President wants land on the Mississippi to form a barrier of hardy Yeomanry on that solitary frontier and to strengthen the ligaments of national union." Simpson gave Wilkinson a list of their Indian debts and Wilkinson forwarded it to Dearborn with the comment that it was a "monstrous sum." The list showed a total debt of \$173,141, of which \$113,512 was due from the Creeks, \$46,091 from the Choctaws, \$11,178 from the Chickasaws, and \$2,358 from the Cherokees.¹⁵

Meanwhile, in May, 1803, Forbes had gone to the Creeks to aid Hawkins in obtaining the Ocmulgee cession. The Creeks were reluctant

¹⁵ Wilkinson to Silas Dinsmore, August 19, 1803, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Retired Classified Files; *id.* to Dearborn, August 20, 1803, *ibid.*; Debts due Panton, Leslie and Company, August 20, 1803, *ibid.*

to sell their Ocmulgee land and again brought up the question of the Florida grant. Forbes agreed to accept a grant in Florida as part payment of the Creek debt and obtained a promise from the Indians that they would cede the Ocmulgee tract to the United States and pay the remainder of the debt out of the money received. He stated also that he would accept the partial payment by land grant only on the condition that the Creeks would eliminate Bowles and induce the Seminoles to participate in the cession. The Creeks arrested Bowles, who had boldly put in his appearance at the council meeting, and turned him over to the Spanish government. Following this the Seminole chiefs agreed to join in the cession.¹⁶

In September, Forbes met Wilkinson on Little River, in the present Alabama, and confirmed the agreement made by Simpson. Forbes promised to cut off the supplies of the Indians unless they agreed to the cessions demanded by the United States. This was no idle threat, for at that time the Creeks, Chickasaws, and Choctaws were dependent on Forbes for practically all their supplies, "our factories being as yet," so wrote Wilkinson, "but a drop in the bucket," while Forbes supplied merchandise to the amount of \$40,000 yearly. Wilkinson knew that the Administration suspected Forbes of opposing the newly-established trading post at St. Stephens and of influencing the Spaniards at Mobile to levy a tariff on goods coming into the post. He therefore advised Forbes to go to Washington and remove Dearborn's distrust by a personal interview. Forbes agreed to go by the beginning of 1804, and Wilkinson prepared the way for him by writing to Dearborn that Forbes was "a gentleman of more than ordinary intelligence and professes a cordial disposition to promote the views of our government in Indian concerns." He added that Dearborn might make Forbes "essentially instrumental in advancing all our objects and interests with the Indians in this quarter."¹⁷

¹⁶ "A Journal of John Forbes, May, 1803," in *loc. cit.*, IX, 279-89. For a good summary of Bowles' activities among the Creeks and Seminoles and his arrest at this time, see Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question*, 173-74.

¹⁷ Wilkinson to Dearborn, October 1, 1803, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Retired Classified Files. Wilkinson had been in correspondence with Forbes previous to

By the time Forbes reached Washington the purchase of Louisiana had been made and the news of it had been received in the United States. Land cessions on the Mississippi were no longer necessary "to form a barrier of hardy yeomanry on that solitary frontier," the solitary frontier having receded several hundred miles to the Rocky Mountains. But Forbes found Dearborn still insistent on obtaining the Mississippi littoral, since it remained desirable to have the hardy yeomanry there to "strengthen the ligaments of national union." In a series of interviews Dearborn and Forbes came to an agreement by which the latter was to induce the Indians to make the desired cessions and the former would see that the purchase money was earmarked for the payment of the debts. It is probable that at least a part of Dearborn's complaisance was due to Forbes' declared intention of withdrawing from the Indian trade as soon as he collected the money due him. It is probable, also, that Dearborn wished to have the benefit of Forbes' influence with the Indians in case war broke out with Spain, as then seemed likely.¹⁸

After leaving Washington Forbes busied himself with the forwarding of the Florida grant and with bringing pressure to bear on the Choctaws and Chickasaws. While he had been in Washington, James Innerarity, one of his junior partners, had petitioned Governor Vicente Folch, January 5, 1804, for permission to accept such a grant and two days later received the permission on condition that the grant never be disposed of by Forbes and Company without the knowledge and consent of the Spanish government. On May 25, 1804, at Cheeskatalofa, on the Chat-tahoochee, a formal grant was given by twenty-two chiefs of the Creeks and Seminoles. The grant lay between the Apalachicola and Wakulla

their meeting on Little River and had informed him that he, Forbes, was "misrepresented" at Washington. He assured him that he was "doing whatever may with consistency and propriety be done to reconcile your interests to those of the United States." Wilkinson to Forbes, August 13, 1803, in "The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of and to John Forbes," *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1935), 239-40. When Forbes went to Washington, Wilkinson gave him a letter of introduction to Alexander Hamilton.

¹⁸ Forbes to Dearborn, September 16, 1806, in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 750-51. It cannot be stated definitely when Forbes reached Washington nor how long he remained. He was there (in Georgetown), on April 28, as is shown by a memorandum he made for the Marquis of Casa Irujo on that date. William Simpson seems to have been with him in Washington.

rivers, and cancelled a Creek-Seminole debt of \$66,553.03, two-thirds of the amount being for damages inflicted by Bowles and his Indian adherents in 1792 and 1800. Meticulously observing all the Spanish forms, the Company had the chiefs confirm the grant before Governor Folch at Pensacola on June 24, again at Achackweithle, on the Apalachicola, on August 22, when they officially conveyed it to Innerarity, and still again at Pensacola on December 3, when they appointed representatives to mark its boundary.¹⁹

While Innerarity was piloting the Florida grant through the mazes of Spanish formalities, Forbes went among the Choctaws. A Choctaw delegation had gone to Washington in the fall of 1803 and had offered to make a cession in the forks of the Alabama and Tombigbee, but their offer had been refused. Now, at Forbes' insistence, the Choctaw chiefs agreed to change their cession to the Mississippi and in August, 1804, sent a petition to Washington asking that the United States buy their land there and pay the Panton, Leslie and Company debt.²⁰ With this petition in hand Dearborn was ready to act. He had already told Hawkins in April to go ahead with the Creek treaty, and in October instructed Dinsmore to arrange with the Choctaws the time for a treaty and to locate the Choctaw-Chickasaw boundary, since the United States proposed to buy all the Choctaw littoral up to the line.²¹

Hawkins called the Creeks to the Flint agency in November and asked them for a cession of their land on the Ocmulgee. There was much opposition among the Creeks to this cession on the ground that so much of the Creek debt had been paid by the Florida grant that it was unnecessary to sell land to pay the remainder. The Creek speaker, Hopoie Mico, exerted his influence for the cession but asked for enough money to pay all the Creek debts—to Americans as well as to Forbes—and in addition an annuity of \$500 to each Creek town, of which there

¹⁹ The source material on the Forbes Purchase is voluminous, but the salient documents are given in *American State Papers, Public Lands*, IV, 159 *et seq.*

²⁰ Forbes to Dearborn, September 5, 1806, in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 750-51; Dearborn to James Robertson and Silas Dinsmore, March 20, 1805, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book B, 47-50.

²¹ Dearborn to Dinsmore, October 25, 1804, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book B, 19-21.

were then thirty-seven. He justified his demands by the fact that the United States was selling its public land for two dollars an acre. The final agreement was on a price of \$200,000 in United States stock, bearing six per cent interest. No provision was made in the treaty for the payment of the Panton, Leslie and Company debts. It may be suspected that Hawkins did not strongly insist on such a provision because he disapproved of Forbes' action in taking the Florida grant, alleging that it had not been made in full council as the Creek law demanded, and because its settlement would attract the worst element of population and make it a nuisance to the Georgia border.²² The Senate rejected the treaty because of the high price and the method of payment. Dearborn directed Hawkins to bring a delegation of Creek chiefs to Washington where, in a more conducive atmosphere, it might be possible to obtain a better treaty. Notwithstanding the attitude of Hawkins and the Creeks, Dearborn was still committed to the program of paying the debts and instructed Hawkins to ascertain what amount the Creeks still owed.²³

While Hawkins was complying with these directions Dearborn went ahead with the Choctaw and Chickasaw treaties. In March, 1805, he named Dinsmore and James Robertson as commissioners to treat with both these tribes. They were instructed to buy from the Choctaws all their land on the Mississippi as far inland as the Big Black, and from the Chickasaws, the land east of the Tennessee between the Duck and Elk, and that west of the Tennessee north of a line from the Duck to the Mississippi. At the very least, they were to secure the land in Kentucky. Dearborn anticipated difficulty in securing the Chickasaw lands on the Mississippi, and so he authorized the commissioners to tell Colbert and the "King" at the outset that they would receive special consideration if they showed a "friendly disposition."²⁴

²² Benjamin Hawkins to Dearborn, November 3, 1804, in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 691-92.

²³ Dearborn to Hawkins, February 12, 1805, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book B, 41-42. Creek affairs were evidently wearing the Secretary's patience thin: "If the Ocmulgee can once be established as a boundary, I trust I shall not live long enough to hear any contention for any other boundary between Georgia and the Creeks." Dearborn to Hawkins, June 28, 1805, *ibid.*, 88.

²⁴ Dearborn to Robertson and Dinsmore, March 20, 1805, *ibid.*, 47-50.

Dinsmore and Robertson began their work with the Choctaws early in the summer of 1805. To their surprise, the Choctaw Upper Towns, which had sent in the petition of the preceding August, now resolutely refused to make a cession, apparently because of the great amount of land demanded and the low price offered.²⁵ There was nothing for the disappointed commissioners to do but go on to the Chickasaws. The Chickasaws refused to sell any of their lands on the Mississippi, but they did cede part of their territory to the east of the Tennessee. Dinsmore, in his opening speech on July 17, said that the United States was buying the land so that the Chickasaws could pay their Panton, Leslie and Company debts and read a letter from William Simpson, itemizing the account and formally demanding payment. The Chickasaws objected to paying interest and to paying the debts of white men living in the nation. Chief Ockoy was the principal opponent of the treaty, but his objections were finally overcome by the commissioners, the Colberts, and the agents of Forbes who were at the treaty and exercised great influence over the Indians. The purchase price of the land was \$20,000 and it was specified that the cession was for the payment of debts. Before the conference ended, the agents of Forbes made strenuous efforts to get an order for the money but all they could obtain was a letter from

²⁵ The Commissioners' report of this meeting is missing. The Secretary of War accused the Upper Choctaws of unmanly and dishonest behavior and instructed Dinsmore to charge the expense of the meeting to them. Dearborn to Dinsmore, August 29, 1805, *ibid.*, 103. Some of the expenses were of a startling character: "The document which has been presented to my view and which has occasioned more surprise than any other is Mr. Chambers' [factor at St. Stephens] bill for articles furnished the commissioners, particularly such as appear to have been intended for their own use. Those articles, generally, so far exceed what I could have contemplated as to produce impressions not very favorable to the prudence or discretion of those who directed the arrangements. . . . The quantity and expense of the articles of highest luxury, such as could not have been intended for Indians, exceed all reasonable bounds. The amount of the most delicate spices, anchovies, raisins, almonds, hyson tea, coffee, mustard, preserves, English cheese, segars, brandy, wine, etc., etc., etc., could not have been either necessary or useful. Many of the articles ought never to have appeared on a bill of expense for an Indian treaty, especially in the wilderness. . . . Such accounts of expense at an Indian treaty have, I presume, never before been exhibited to our Government, and it is to be wished we may never have a second exhibition of this kind. It may not be improper to inquire whether any part of the articles charged in Mr. Chambers' bill remain on hand; and if so, what disposition is to be made of them." Dearborn to Dinsmore, August 28, 1805, *ibid.*, 101-102.

Colbert to Simpson promising to turn over the money to him as soon as the Indians received it.²⁶

In November, 1805, the two commissioners went back to the Choctaws and, aided by the strenuous exertions of Forbes' agents, secured a cession. They did not, however, obtain the Mississippi cession they wanted, but accepted a tract along the Florida border which the tribe finally offered as a compromise between the Mississippi land and that in the forks of the Alabama and Tombigbee. The treaty provided that \$48,000 of the purchase money of \$55,500 was to be used for the payment of the Panton, Leslie and Company debts. When Jefferson received the treaty he was so disappointed with it that he would not send it to the Senate for ratification.²⁷

On November 14, 1805, two days before the Choctaw treaty was made, Creek chiefs signed a treaty at Washington ceding their Ocmulgee land in return for an annuity of \$12,000 for eight years and \$11,000 for ten years. Hawkins had had difficulty persuading the Creeks to authorize the Washington trip. The Creeks had intercepted a letter from Wilkinson to Forbes in which he suggested that after the Ocmulgee cession was completed, Forbes should press the Indians for an additional grant as far up as the Flint. Moreover, the Cherokees, exasperated over the proposed sale by the Chickasaws of land claimed by themselves, were urging that all four tribes join in a league to refuse all land cessions, and their delegation was in the Creek country at the time Hawkins was urging the Washington trip.²⁸ Notwithstanding these untoward manifestations Hawkins secured his delegation to Washington, which resulted in the treaty of November 14. The Creeks refused to put in the treaty any provision for paying their debts with the purchase money, although Dearborn urged them to do so.²⁹

²⁶ The Journal of the Chickasaw Commission, July 6 to July 25, 1803, comprising seventy manuscript pages, is in Interior Department, Indian Office, Retired Classified Files. For the Chickasaw meeting as viewed by Forbes' agent, see "John Forbes & Co., Successors to Panton, Leslie & Company, vs. The Chickasaw Nation: A Journal of an Indian Talk," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, VIII (1930), 131-42.

²⁷ Forbes to Dearborn, September 5, 1806, in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 750-51; Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 434-35.

²⁸ *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 440-46.

²⁹ Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book B, 154-56, 157-60.

Forbes had been in Europe during this flurry of land cessions and when he returned in April, 1806, he was much chagrined to find that for all the activity of his agents and the collusion of the United States he had received nothing but the Chickasaw debt of \$12,000—the smallest of the three. For a time he kept his patience and when in May, 1806, the Creek council met to consider ratification of the Washington treaty he sent one of his partners, John Innerarity, to urge the Creeks to make provision for the payment of the money due him. The Creeks refused, on the ground that their Florida grant had cancelled their debts. Forbes offered to give up his grant if the Creeks would pay the debt out of their land money, but they persisted in their refusal. In September, 1806, Forbes finally appealed to Dearborn, reminding him of their agreement in 1804 and recounting the aid his agents had given in the treaties of 1805. He explained the Florida grant, showing that it was chiefly in compensation for the Bowles depredations and that nearly \$40,000 of Creek debts remained unpaid. He repeated the offer that he had made the Creeks to give up the Florida grant if the Creeks would pay the full amount. In reply, Dearborn explained that the Creeks had refused to make provision in the treaty for paying their debts but had promised to pay the balance due out of their annuity. He said that the Chickasaw debt was provided and that the Choctaw debt would be paid when the treaty was ratified—as he evidently thought it would be. The tone of Dearborn's letter was by no means cordial and the reason came out in his concluding sentence, which hinted that Forbes had been influencing the Spaniards at Mobile to retain their tariff wall. Evidently the old ghost which Wilkinson and Forbes had tried to lay in 1804 was walking again. The correspondence between the two men closed with a letter from Forbes in February, 1807, in which he vigorously denied any complicity in the Spanish tariff policy, asserted bluntly that in 1804 Dearborn had pledged his aid in the debt collection, and demanded that Hawkins be instructed to insist to the Creeks that they pay their debts out of their annuity or provide for them by another sale of land.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ This correspondence consisted of a letter from Forbes, September 5, 1806, a reply by Dearborn, November 12, 1806, and another letter from Forbes, February 7, 1807. All are given in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 750-51.

Dearborn was apparently unmoved, and at the beginning of 1808 Forbes, after three years of effort, had salvaged from his Indian claims only the small Chickasaw debt and the Florida grant, to which Governor Folch had given him formal title on December 3, 1806. But circumstances aided Forbes in 1808 just as they had in 1802. Then it had been the Mississippi question that made him necessary; now it was the West Florida Controversy that came to his rescue. The relations between the United States and Spain had been steadily deteriorating for several years as the former insisted on her claim of territory to the Perdido and the latter insisted on her tariff at Mobile. There were other matters of dispute, such as the spoliation claims, border conflicts, and the Pike expedition. In 1807 the two countries seemed on the verge of war and President Jefferson had now to think of the Florida frontier as in 1802 he had had to think of the Mississippi frontier. It was now on the Florida border that there was needed a hardy yeomanry, and under the circumstances the disappointing Choctaw cession of 1805 took on a new importance.

Jefferson took the treaty out of its two-years' retirement, sent it up to the Senate on January 15, 1808, and recommended favorable action on it.³¹ Its ratification and the consequent appropriation made the money available for the Choctaw debt and Simpson was at once notified of the news in a cordial letter which assured him that the money would be turned over directly to Forbes and not sent to the Choctaws.³² Dinsmore was absent from the Choctaw country at the time, but when he returned in May, 1808, the War Department sent him a draft for \$48,000 with instructions to check the list of debts and pay over the money to Forbes.³³ At a Choctaw meeting on October 17 Simpson presented his list for \$46,091.31 $\frac{1}{4}$, less \$10,325.68 $\frac{3}{4}$ which the traders had paid in to Forbes and for which they claimed reimbursement from Dinsmore. Two difficulties arose. Simpson's list had itemized some of the Choctaw debts as

³¹ *Ibid.*, 748-49.

³² John Graham to William Simpson, February 14, 1808, in "The Panton, Leslie Papers," *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XVI (1937), 44.

³³ Dearborn to Dinsmore, May 16, 1808, in Interior Department, Indian Office, Secretary of War Letter Book B, 380.

"bad," meaning by the latter term "irrecoverable." These "bad" debts, which amounted to \$5,461.37½, Dinsmore refused to pay, either because of a misunderstanding of his orders or because of other reasons.

The other difficulty was over an account of \$4,304.25 against a Choctaw half-breed, Ben James, who had removed to Virginia and had been sued by Forbes in the Virginia courts. Dinsmore refused payment of this on the ground that the suit was still pending. Dinsmore gave Simpson \$26,000, paid the traders \$10,325.68¾ and refused to pay the remainder.³⁴ Forbes at once wrote to Dinsmore in protest and Dinsmore forwarded the protest to Dearborn,³⁵ who instructed him to pay the "bad" debts and Dinsmore, in April, 1809, gave Simpson a check for another \$5,461.37½ leaving unpaid only the James debt. In August, 1809, while Dinsmore was in New Orleans, Simpson brought suit against him in the New Orleans courts but was non-suited on a technicality. When Dinsmore returned to Mississippi he secured an attachment for \$8,100 against Simpson's property and Simpson retaliated in 1810 by suing him before the territorial courts for the James debt and \$437.25 for debts contracted by the Choctaws after the treaty was made. In October, 1810, Simpson went to Washington to appeal to Secretary of War William Eustis, who had succeeded Dearborn. He charged that Dinsmore was withholding the money to use in private speculation and asked Eustis to appoint a committee of investigation.³⁶ Eustis as-

³⁴ Dinsmore to Simpson, April 25, 1809, in Carter (ed.), *Territorial Papers*, VI, *Mississippi Territory* (1938), 126-27.

³⁵ *Id.* to Dearborn, December 8, 1808, *ibid.*, V, 675-78. In his protest to Dinsmore, Simpson pointed out that it was only because the debts were "bad" that his firm had to take this roundabout method of collection. Apparently at the time Simpson wrote his protest (October 27, 1808) the question of the James debt had not arisen, for the protest made no mention of it.

³⁶ Simpson to William Eustis, October 19, 1810, *ibid.*, VI, 123-26; *id.* to *id.* October 24, 1810, in War Department, Adjutant General's Office, Old Records Division. In his letter of October 19, Simpson explained that the James debt had been contracted by Ben James in partnership with his son, George, that Ben went to Virginia and Forbes brought suit against him there because he could not collect from George. Ben denied the partnership, and Forbes discontinued the suit since it was difficult to take testimony at such a distance, and the Choctaw treaty was in prospect. Since then Ben had died, and Dinsmore had instigated Ben James, Jr., to enter a caveat against the payment of the James debt out of the proceeds of the Choctaw cession.

sured him that justice would be done and called upon Dinsmore for an explanation of his conduct. Dinsmore, in defense, stated that he was withholding the James debt because the Virginia suit was still pending and said that no money had been given him for debts contracted after the treaty.³⁷ Eustis apparently left the matter to the courts and Simpson's suit against Dinsmore was still pending in the Mississippi territorial district court at the outbreak of the War of 1812.³⁸

In the meantime, while Simpson was trying to bring Dinsmore to terms Forbes turned his attention again to the collection of the remaining Creek debt. He cancelled \$19,387 of it for another land grant in Florida, which extended his former grant northward and eastward. This grant was made at Tuskatoloofta, on the Chattahoochee, on April 10, 1810, and was signed by eighteen chiefs of the Creeks and Seminoles. The grant passed through all the Spanish forms and Forbes received title to it from Folch on June 5, 1811.³⁹ The final act in the debt collection came in October, 1812, when John Innerarity, a junior partner in John Forbes and Company, went to Tuckabatchee and after considerable negotiating arranged with the Creeks for the payment of the remaining \$21,916, to be paid \$5,000 down and the balance in two equal installments on November 1, 1813, and November 1, 1814. The Creeks gave him a draft on Hawkins for the \$5,000 and the installment contract was signed by Big Warrior, speaker of the Upper Creeks and of the nation, by William McIntosh, speaker of the Lower Creeks, and by Tustenugee Hopoie. It was witnessed by Timothy Barnard and Alex Cornell, who were Hawkins' deputies, and by Christian Limbaugh, the assistant Creek agent. It was witnessed also by a Cherokee delegation which was present to dissuade the Creeks from taking part in the War of 1812.⁴⁰

³⁷ Eustis to Dinsmore, October 23, 1810, in Carter (ed.), *Territorial Papers*, VI, 127-28; Dinsmore to Eustis, December 12, 1810, *ibid.*, 159-60.

³⁸ "A letter of James Innerarity [July 11, 1812]; William Pantton's Estate," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, X (1932), 185-94.

³⁹ *American State Papers, Public Lands*, IV, 167.

⁴⁰ "The Creek Nation, Debtor to John Forbes & Co., Successors to Pantton, Leslie and Co.: A Journal of John Innerarity, 1812," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, IX (1930), 67-89.

The connivance of Barnard, Cornell, and Limbaugh shows that the United States was again actively aiding Forbes and that Hawkins was once more collaborating. The reason is not far to seek. In the War of 1812 the United States was apprehensive that the southern Indians, particularly the Creeks, would join with Great Britain. It was no time to alienate anyone who had so much influence with the Indians as Forbes had. So in 1812 Forbes was aided in his debt collection campaign by our war with England as he had been in 1808 by our dispute with Spain and in 1802 by our distrust of France.

Economic Sectionalism in Georgia Politics, 1825-1855

BY PAUL MURRAY

The state of Georgia is divided into three distinct geographic regions—the mountain highland, the Piedmont plateau, and the coastal plain. These are generally designated as North, South, and Middle Georgia, and as such they have not only entered into common parlance, but they have also been the basis for the interpretation of the political history of the state. Close observers have noted that however successful political leaders might be in establishing sectional followings it has been impossible for any group of political leaders to maintain a hold on a majority of voters in the state for more than two or three successive elections. Historical observers outside the state, viewing only these erratic results, have given less regard to the basic geographic sectionalism in the state. Some have regarded Georgia politics as a senseless maze of uncertainty resulting perhaps from the ignorant and backward status of Georgia voters. An analysis of eleven statewide elections in the generation preceding the Civil War and a correlation of the data thus assembled with the economic development of the state seem to indicate that both these interpretations fall short of a satisfactory explanation of the basic factors in Georgia politics. Viewed in this light, the political history of Georgia becomes a record of the interaction between forces of human ecology and the deliberate design of human and sometimes errant party leaders.¹

¹ This study is an outgrowth of a doctoral dissertation, "The Whig Party in Georgia, 1825-1853," prepared under the direction of Professor Fletcher M. Green at the University of North Carolina. For a recent example of the assumption that "Georgia cracker" is synonymous with cultural backwardness, see Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager,

The first party organization to face squarely the problem of appealing to voters throughout the state was the Troup-State Rights party. This was a state organization made up of the supporters of George Michael Troup, who was elected governor in 1823 by a narrow majority in the General Assembly. In the gubernatorial election of 1825, the first by popular vote in Georgia, "the friends of Governor Troup" made a determined canvass of the state and returned their leader for a second term as the chief executive of the state. During Troup's second term there developed considerable opposition in the party to his policy of internal improvements at state expense, and he accepted election to the United States Senate, leaving in other hands the active leadership of the party that bore his name. In 1833 the Troup party joined the opposition to President Andrew Jackson and took the name State Rights party.²

Since this party was in the minority throughout most of the decade of the 1830's, its leaders readily abandoned the legislative caucus as a nominating device and adopted the party convention for the nomination of candidates for governor and members of the Federal House of Representatives, then elected on the general ticket system. They built a compact state organization with groups of local leaders active in most of the counties of the state. Interest was maintained at a high level by offering candidates for local offices and by sending the best speakers to rallies held in various parts of the state that were accompanied by barbecues and other appeals to the inner man. Since the governor was elected in odd years, members of Congress in even years, and members of the General Assembly every year until 1843, political activity followed the cycle of the seasons as regularly as cotton planting and harvesting. Plans were made in the legislative caucuses during the winter, issues were agitated and party lines were maintained by newspaper

The Growth of the American Republic, 2 vols. (New York, 1942), I, 489-90. The original and still the most clear-cut interpretation based on geographical tri-sectionalism is Ulrich B. Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights* (Washington, 1902), *passim*.

² Macon *Georgia Messenger*, November 21, 1833; *The Examiner and Journal of Political Economy* (Philadelphia, 1833-1834), I (1833), 150-52; Stephen F. Miller, *The Bench and Bar of Georgia, Memoirs and Sketches*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1858), I, 27-30; Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights*, 87-88, 96-108, 121-38.

editors during the spring, conventions were held in the summer months, and the high point of public activity was reached in the campaigns of late summer and elections of early fall.³

For the purpose of revealing the relation between political activity and economic sectionalism in the state, seven of these annual elections for the period from 1832 to 1838, are herewith summarized, and counties are classified into four groups according to their support of the Troup-State Rights party.⁴ Fifteen counties gave a majority to this party in every one of the seven elections. Designated here as Group One, they were made up of two counties in the coast region—Bryan and Effingham; and thirteen Piedmont counties—Troup, Harris, Columbia, Warren, Hancock, Taliaferro, Greene, Putnam, Newton, Clarke, Oglethorpe, Elbert, and Jefferson. All of these except Newton and Troup had a slave population of at least forty per cent. Newton County, the home of Emory College, was known as a center of culture and refinement.⁵ Troup County was made up of creek valley cotton lands and was the home of Julius C. Alford, a State Rights partisan and a well-recognized political figure in the state. LaGrange, the seat of its government, soon became a thriving supply town, its business supplemented by a cotton factory of 1,600 spindles, ten flour mills, and eleven saw-mills.⁶ Located in the cotton area of the Piedmont, these two counties were not fundamentally different from the eleven other Piedmont counties and two coastal counties which voted State Rights constantly. They were simply communities in which property and property ownership were important factors in the political life of the people. Since the Piedmont of Georgia was at that time devoted mainly to agriculture, slaves and land constituted the principal types of property; and the

³ Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights*, 95-142.

⁴ Election returns with party designations were located in: *Macon Georgia Telegraph*, November 7, 1832, October 30, 1838; *Macon Georgia Messenger*, October 17, 1833, October 19, 1837; *Milledgeville Federal Union*, November 29, 1836. The great increase in the number of counties has not changed their relative position, and any good map of the state may be used for identification of the various counties mentioned.

⁵ Wirt A. Cate, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Secession and Reunion* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 23-24.

⁶ George White, *Statistics of the State of Georgia* (Savannah, 1849), 547-51.

political struggles of the late 1820's and the 1830's identified the State Rights party with the slaveholding agricultural class.

In the sixteen counties of Marion, Upson, Monroe, Jasper, Morgan, Lincoln, Montgomery, Laurens, Tattnall, Liberty, Glynn, Richmond, Burke, Screven, Thomas, and Lowndes, constituting Group Two in this study, the State Rights party was successful in at least five of seven appeals to the voters of the state. The proportion of slaves to the white population of these counties was similar to that in Group One, though seven counties in this group had a slave population of less than forty per cent of the whole. Lowndes, Montgomery, Tattnall, and Thomas were the only counties in the interior of South Georgia where State Rights strength was fairly constant. Tattnall and Montgomery comprised thousands of acres of pine-barren territory entirely unsuited to cotton culture and the slave system of agriculture. Population was thinly spread, and the influences of learning and culture never extended into the remote settlements of the backwoods.⁷ Consequently, politics in these counties was an affair of the village communities along the banks of the Oconee and Alapaha rivers, the principal lines of contact between the coast and the cotton Piedmont. The lands of Lowndes and Thomas counties were predominantly of the well-drained gray-red loam type, highly esteemed for cotton growing. It was reported that much of this land was capable of producing 1,000 pounds of long staple or 1,400 pounds of short staple cotton per acre. Among the first grantees of land in these counties were many friends of George M. Troup.⁸ As in the counties of Tattnall and Montgomery the vote was small and, unless unusual circumstances stirred the backwoodsmen into action, majorities were cast for the State Rights party. Marion and Upson counties, with twenty-five and forty per cent slaves, respectively, were made up of good cotton lands, and were directly in the line of communication between the Chattahoochee River and the economic center of the state.⁹ In

⁷ Ulrich B. Phillips (ed.), *Plantation and Frontier Documents, 1649-1863*, 2 vols. (Cleveland, 1909), 167.

⁸ White, *Statistics of Georgia*, 385-86, 544-45. The first seat of government for Lowndes County was Troupville, now one of Georgia's dead river towns. Valdosta, the present county seat, was named for Troup's home in Laurens County.

⁹ *Sixth Census or Enumeration of the Inhabitants of the United States in 1840* (Washington, 1841), 235, 237; White, *Statistics of Georgia*, 573-76.

these counties of Group Two the hopes of the "numerous democracy" were held in the status of unrealized dreams by the determination of State Rights leaders to keep the government safe for the property interests. In counties of Group One and Two the State Rights party was virtually supreme during the 1830's; it is significant that in these counties cotton was king, and its subjects paid homage through the mediums of growing, shipping, or manufacturing the fleecy staple.

The thirteen counties of Gwinnett, Jones, Baldwin, Washington, Bibb, Talbot, Muscogee, Sumter, Chatham, Lee, Telfair, McIntosh, and Decatur returned majorities for the State Rights party in not less than two nor more than four of seven elections during the 1830's. The despair of the political leaders because of their changeable political complexion, they are designated in this study as Group Three. They were the doubtful counties and conformed to no uniform economic pattern. In point of corporate age the purely agrarian counties in this group ranged from Washington, founded in 1784, to Sumter, set off from Lee in 1831. In ratio of slave population the range was from seventy-eight per cent in McIntosh to eighteen per cent in Lee. In degree of culture and refinement Chatham with its social pattern of more than a hundred years standing was in strong contrast to Decatur, described as "a low, sunken frog-pond" and a hunter's paradise.¹⁰ Though the range in degree of property and of culture in the counties of Group Three was too large for complete analysis, the types of culture represented two extremes: settled areas surrounding municipal centers, and frontier regions. Chatham and McIntosh, coast counties with seventy-three and seventy-eight per cent slave population, might have ordinarily found their economic interests in accord with the State Rights party. But slaves were not the only form of property important in these counties. Savannah, in Chatham, had commercial interests which were not likely to be served by the State Rights program of opposition to the Second Bank of the United States. The chief agricultural industry in these two counties was the production of rice, and the inhabitants, whether plant-

¹⁰ *Compendium of the Enumeration of the Inhabitants and Statistics of the United States in 1840* (Washington, 1841), 51; White, *Statistics of Georgia*, 202.

ers or merchants, had little in common with the cotton growers of the interior.

In the doubtful counties of Baldwin, Bibb, Jones, Muscogee, Talbot, and Washington, the conflict was between economic and political forces. Muscogee in 1830 had a slave population of thirty-six per cent and was rapidly filling up with cotton growers who exploited the shallow topsoil of the hillsides before turning to the slower and more complicated process of establishing one of the first industrial and commercial centers of the state.¹¹ Bibb County had a slave population nearly equal to its white population, and Macon, the principal town, was rapidly becoming a trade center for Middle and West Georgia.¹² Baldwin's percentage of slave population in 1830 was sixty-three. In all of these counties slaves constituted over forty per cent of the total population, indicating that investments in commercial cotton growing were heavy. It would thus be normally expected that these counties would be unwavering in their support of the State Rights party. Located in the area of these counties were the municipalities of Columbus, Macon, and Milledgeville, cultural and social centers for property-conscious families in their vicinity. But these municipalities were also trade centers and depended for their prosperity on frontier hinterlands whose needs must be served, and whose cultural and political demands could not be ignored. Both State Rights and Union newspapers were located in all these towns, and their columns were filled with a curious jumble of political notices and editorials, advertisements of planting supplies and runaway slaves, sentimental short stories, and notices concerning various activities. The emphasis on political polemics attested to the presence of well-balanced party strength and indicated the importance of newspaper editors in the politics of the decade.

The frontier counties in the doubtful column were Decatur, Lee, Sumter, and Telfair. In these counties the average percentage of slave population was about thirty, and all of these counties had some land suited to cotton growing. Not a single State Rights victory was gained

¹¹ *Sixth Census of the United States*, 235; George White, *Historical Collections of Georgia* (New York, 1855), 568-70.

¹² *Sixth Census of the United States*, 233; White, *Statistics of Georgia*, 108-112.

in any of these counties until 1835; however, as frontier settlements widened into farming communities, these four counties took their places in the column of the doubtful group. These counties in the 1830's were in the process of transition from frontier communities to farming areas. They and the other counties of Group Three where political, cultural, and social forces created a delicate balance of power furnished the crucial votes that meant party success or failure during the 1830's. Political leaders recognized this fact, and the most determined efforts were put forth by leaders of both parties in these counties.

The leaders in the State Rights party were closely associated with the cotton area of Middle Georgia, though many of them lived in the doubtful counties of Group Three. The counties within Groups One and Two, normally counted in advance in the State Rights column, furnished forty-one of the ninety-seven purely party appointments¹³ between 1831 and 1839. Twenty-nine of these came from Piedmont counties of heavy cotton production. Eleven of the twelve from South Georgia were members of an executive committee appointed in 1835 on the basis of three men to each judicial district. The Piedmont counties of Groups One and Two furnished thirty-seven of fifty-seven State Rights nominations for office. Glynn, a coast county in Group Two, was the home of Thomas Butler King, who was nominated for Congress in 1836 and 1838, thus giving Groups One and Two a total of thirty-nine nominations for office.

Group Three, made up of thirteen doubtful counties, furnished the State Rights party forty-two party appointments, one more than was furnished by the thirty-one unquestioned State Rights counties of Groups One and Two. Of these, thirty-six came from the counties of Baldwin, Bibb, Chatham, and Muscogee, the newspaper centers of the doubtful area, indicating again the large part played by editors in the conduct of party affairs. The remaining six were all members of the 1835 execu-

¹³ The term "party appointments" refers to chairmen and secretaries of state conventions, members of permanent committees named by such conventions, and nominees for the speakership or presidency of the two houses of the General Assembly. "Nominations for office" include nominees for governor, United States senator, members of Congress, and presidential electors.

tive committee. These thirteen doubtful counties also furnished fourteen of the State Rights nominations for office during the period. It is noticeable that doubtful counties were given more recognition in party appointments than in nominations for office, which went more often to dwellers in the unquestioned State Rights counties of Groups One and Two. In fact, a good proportion of the nominees from doubtful counties were recent removals from counties in Groups One and Two.

Group Four in this study is made up of the forty-nine counties that gave a majority to the State Rights party not more than once during the period 1832 to 1838. Thirty-five of these counties were in existence before 1832, and all of the fourteen counties formed during these seven years began their political careers as Union strongholds, only five of them giving a single majority to the State Rights party. In the all-important Piedmont area there were seventeen counties in Group Four. Of all these, only Wilkes had a slave population of more than forty per cent. This county was in the heart of the cotton kingdom, the only exception to the rule of State Rights strength in that area. Other Middle Georgia counties in Group Four were located in the Upper Piedmont and had less than a decade of corporate existence behind them in 1831. The remaining counties of Group Four were fairly evenly divided between the mountain area and the coastal plains section.

The Union counties of Group Four furnished the State Rights party only three party appointments exclusive of the committee of 1835 already mentioned, and eleven members of that committee. From the same counties came four nominations for the honors of office. Significantly enough, every State Rights leader from these counties passed over into the Union party or retired from politics by 1840.

During the 1830's the state was thus divided into three distinct but not contiguous geographic-political regions. The dwellers in the red loam area of Middle Georgia and the counties along the navigable rivers made up the kingdom of cotton, and a majority of them consistently supported the State Rights party. The people of the hill counties of northeastern Georgia, the frontier counties of northwestern Georgia, and the sand-hill counties of South Georgia followed subsistence

methods of farming, voted for Union party candidates for state offices, and cheered their hero, Andrew Jackson, in national politics. Interspersed in this crazy quilt pattern were the politically doubtful counties where economic development was in transition from frontier to farm, or where the inhabitants were engaged in varied economic, cultural, and political activities.¹⁴

In the party battles of the 1830's the State Rights party had the advantages of popularity in the thickly populated area of the state and a group of very able leaders; the Union party had the advantages of an alliance with the Democratic administration of the federal government and a system of representation based primarily on counties rather than population. In its insistence on revision of the system of representation the State Rights party's most effective spokesman was George R. Gilmer. As governor in 1831 he said in a message to the General Assembly: "Most counties which have thus acquired an undue proportion of power, are in the same section of the state, which, from its climate and soil, must always be sparsely populated, so that the inequality of representation which exists at present, must continue to increase."¹⁵

Gilmer lived to see his prophecy partly refuted. During the 1830's and 1840's Georgia was the scene of two remarkable economic developments. In the first place, the opening of new counties and the filling in of the western area of the state from the mountains to the Florida line extinguished the state's last agricultural frontier. As the population increased, there was created a demand for primary industries. Gristmills,

¹⁴ Unless otherwise noted, the numerical data herein presented were derived from reports of political activities in Union and State Rights newspapers at Milledgeville, Macon, Columbus, and Savannah. A statistical summary follows:

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	State
Number of counties.....	15	16	13	49	93
Counties in Piedmont.....	13	8	7	17	45
Counties having 40% or more slaves.....	13	9	5	8	35
State Rights party appointments		41	42	14	97
State Rights nominations.....		39	14	4	57

¹⁵ Macon *Advertiser*, November 11, 1831; see also *Georgia Senate Journal*, 1831, pp. 18-19.

turpentine distilleries, flour mills, and sawmills appeared first, and remained the most numerous of these small units of manufacturing industry. In the second place, successful planters began investing their earnings in these industries and others more ambitious in size and character. Consequently, foundries, breweries, cotton mills and shoe factories soon began to develop in the thickly populated area of Middle Georgia.

In the Piedmont, ambitious beginnings were made in the establishment of an economy balanced between industry and agriculture. According to the census of 1840, the total value of carriage and wagon factories, flour mills, gristmills, sawmills, oil mills, furniture factories, and "other manufactures" was \$1,659,587.¹⁶ In 1845, fifteen cotton mills were reported active, with \$1,000,000 invested in cotton manufactures alone. Common laborers were plentiful at ten to fifty cents per day, and profits as high as twenty per cent per year were the normal expectation of capitalists.¹⁷ By 1849 the number of cotton factories had increased to thirty-six, and stock had been subscribed for six additional companies devoted to the manufacturing of cotton. Five of these mills were located in Muscogee County, four each in Clarke and Upson counties, and the remaining twenty-three were scattered over the Piedmont area.¹⁸ In 1850 Augusta was the home of a cotton factory, a machine shop, a bucket and barrel factory, two foundries, a brewery, and several smaller industries of various kinds. Columbus had, in addition to the usual grist and flour mills, one paper mill and three cotton mills representing about \$200,000 invested in equipment alone. The wages of laborers ranged from twelve to fifty cents per day. At the same time, overseers could be hired at one to two dollars per day, while competent superintendents were receiving \$900 to \$1,000 per year. Small wonder that one of the mills reported profits of ten to fifteen per cent per year.¹⁹ As insignificant as these enterprises seem in comparison with twentieth

¹⁶ *Compendium of the Sixth Census*, 208.

¹⁷ *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), VI (1848), 292-94, gives a digest of responses to a questionnaire sent out by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1845.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, VII (1849), 454-55.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, IX (1850), 215, 430-31.

century industrial development, they are sufficient to indicate the beginnings of industrialism in the most thickly populated section of the state.

While manufacturing was thus in an embryonic state, the production of raw cotton for sale was expanding rapidly in area and volume. By 1850 the cotton kingdom was sharply bounded on the north by the line of the foothills.²⁰ North of this line was an area of smaller cotton production, only one county wide on the east, but widening to the west to include five counties along the Chattahoochee River. In these Upper Piedmont counties, where small holdings were the rule, less than 5,000 bales of cotton per county were produced. Likewise, in these counties less than a third of the land was cleared, while in the Lower Piedmont more than half the land suitable for planting had started on the process of exploitation that meant the spread of financial ruin for planters.²¹

In South Georgia the boundary of the cotton area was equally as sharply marked off by the pine-barren and wire-grass counties. Again in West Georgia, the youngest section of the state, the area of heavy production had the greatest north-south extent, reaching to the Florida line. Lowndes and Glynn counties produced less than 5,000 bales each, but production in these counties was mainly of the sea island or long staple variety, usually worth about twice as much per pound as the short staple variety.²² In the red-hill counties south of the fall line, holdings were slightly larger than those in the Lower Piedmont, the population was more than half slave, and one-fourth of the land was cleared and planted.²³

In spite of the far-reaching political implications now evident in these divergent sectional developments, party managers in Georgia during the late 1830's and the 1840's were too much absorbed in the problem of the proper relation of their organizations to the national parties to give much attention to these economic realities. The Union

²⁰ Ralph B. Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia* (Chapel Hill, 1933), 86.

²¹ Roland M. Harper, "Development of Agriculture in Upper Georgia from 1850 to 1880," in *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (Savannah, 1917-), VI (1922), 13-14, 18.

²² Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*, 55-57.

²³ Roland M. Harper, "Development of Agriculture in Lower Georgia from 1850 to 1880," in *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, VI, 111.

group gave up its identity as a purely state group first and joined forces with Jacksonian democracy. The State Rights leaders held out longer, but were finally driven by the long hunger for public office to declare their party an ally of the Whig party in the "log cabin and hard cider" campaign of 1840. The congressional election of 1842 completed the process of amalgamation in leadership and issues, and George Walker Crawford was elected governor in 1843 as the nominee of the Whig party.²⁴ For the remaining ten years covered by this study, parties in Georgia were merely state divisions of national parties, though many of the older leaders were highly dissatisfied with the restraints thus put upon them. Also during these years the Whigs drew farther and farther from their national organization because of its unsatisfactory stand on the issue of slavery in the territories. In the meantime, the Democratic party was going through the strange metamorphosis of becoming a well-knit national machine in control of sectional-minded Southerners. The final test of strength in Georgia came in the presidential election of 1852, when the Whigs divided into three warring factions. A short respite followed, but the end of the Whig party was certain and the triumph of the Democratic machine was complete by 1855. In that year the Democratic gubernatorial nominee, Herschel V. Johnson, won the election by an overwhelming majority over a polyglot opposition gathered loosely under the banners of the Temperance party and the Know-Nothings.²⁵

During the decade and a half that ended in 1855, economic development in Georgia followed the line of rapid agricultural expansion accompanied by an increase in primary manufactures in the Piedmont section. Political reaction to the resulting shift in economic interests may be readily seen in an analysis of four elections, the presidential elections of 1844, 1848, 1852, and the gubernatorial election of 1853. The Democrats won in Georgia in 1844 by a close decision; the Whigs

²⁴ Macon *Georgia Messenger*, May 4, June 22, October 19, 1837; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, July 7, 1840, June 22, 1841, June 28, August 16, 23, December 20, 1842, January 3, June 27, 1843.

²⁵ Miller, *Bench and Bar of Georgia*, I, 92-97, 267; Linton Stephens to A. H. Stephens, in James D. Waddell (ed.), *Biographical Sketch of Linton Stephens* (Atlanta, 1877), 116-17.

achieved a substantial victory in 1848; while the Democrats swept the state and almost annihilated the Whig party in 1852. In the gubernatorial election of 1853 Whig leaders made a vain effort to restore their state machine, but they could not disassociate themselves from the Compromise of 1850 and lost by a narrow majority.

In these elections only four South Georgia counties outside the area of large cotton production voted Whig in three or four elections.²⁶ Lowndes and Glynn, the sea island cotton counties, and Montgomery and Tattnall, along the north bank of the Alapaha River, followed the Whig party. In that part of South Georgia not absorbed into the cotton kingdom, support for the Democratic party remained constant.

In those counties producing more than 5,000 bales of cotton annually, the ratio of party strength was the reverse of that in the sand-hill area. Of the fifty-two cotton counties in Middle and Southwest Georgia, thirty returned three or four Whig majorities, five counties divided their majority votes equally between the two parties, four counties gave the Whigs one majority vote, and thirteen counties consistently supported the Democratic party. Three-fifths of the vote in the cotton region could thus be safely counted Whig in advance, unless some unusual circumstances arose. In such case, the Whigs stood the chance to lose as much as two-thirds of their maximum strength, since twenty-one of the normally safe Whig counties gave one majority to the Democrats. Though the number of Democratic counties in the cotton region was smaller than that of the Whig persuasion by one-third, the margin of safety for the Democrats was greater. Only four of the seventeen normally safe Democratic counties failed to give constant support to their party. In the fourteen counties of the Upper Piedmont, where commercial cotton growing was supplemented by general farming, only two counties returned three out of four majorities for Whig nominees. They were Gwinnett and Madison, hard by the Lower Piedmont, and populated largely by small planters who had been attracted to the State Rights party by its insistence on equalization of representation in the General Assembly.

²⁶ Election returns with party designations in Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, November 19, 1844, November 21, 1848, November 16, 1852, October 25, 1853.

The total voting strength of the State Rights party fell short of equality with the Union party throughout the decade of the 1830's. During these years success at the polls was determined by the vote of several doubtful counties. Some of these counties were focal points of newspaper controversy; others were frontier counties possessing fine cotton lands, or located on the lines of transportation from Middle Georgia to the coast. When the issues of sane, orderly government and conservative methods of public finance in the state government outweighed the demands for democratic action of the state in the interest of its citizens, these counties gave the majority of their suffrages to the State Rights party. During the 1840's the Democratic party outgrew its frontier youth; the geographic incidence of party strength became more marked; and doubtful counties became scarce enough to be virtually a negligible factor in statewide contests. For example, Screven and Jasper counties passed over from the State Rights column into the Democratic column; and Bibb, Jones, and Chatham ceased their wavering between the parties and consistently supported the Democratic party. During these years the cotton planting system reached its height in Middle Georgia and began making adjustments in the direction of diversified farming and investments in primary types of industrial processing of farm products.²⁷ The emerging class of farmers and planter-capitalists did not support the Whig party with the same fervor that had been shown for the State Rights party during the prosperous years of the middle 1830's. The gains of the party in the western part of the state, where capitalistic farming was increasing, were not sufficient to balance outright losses in the Lower Piedmont, where the rate of the growth of Democratic strength was almost exactly the same as that of the decline of the planting system.

²⁷ Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*, 66-81; Ulrich B. Phillips, "Origin and Growth of Southern Black Belts," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XI (1906), 798-817; Harper, "Development of Agriculture in Upper Georgia from 1850 to 1880," in *loc. cit.*, 1-27; Ulrich B. Phillips, "The Economic Cost of Slaveholding," in *Political Science Quarterly* (New York, 1886-), XX (1905), 257-67; Avery O. Craven, "Agricultural Reformers of the Ante-Bellum South," in *American Historical Review*, XXXIII (1928), 302-314.

The Democratic party in Georgia emerged from the protest of ordinary people against control of the government by a caucus made up of an oligarchy of able leaders in the Troup party. Nurtured in its youth by the Jackson administration, it was later able to survive a critical division between a conservative and a liberal group in the days of its success in state politics. During the 1840's its rival was enticed by the long hunger for public office and the fool's gold of a balanced national economy into an unfavorable national alliance, while Democratic leaders concentrated their attention on maintaining control of a majority of those counties that were passing from a frontier status into a full-fledged plantation economy. As cotton planting in the eastern part of the Piedmont fell behind in competition with the newer sections, the national Whig party became involved in the highly disruptive issues of public finance and slavery in the territories. In this contingency Georgia Whigs deserted the party they had formed to promote the interests of their specialized type of commercial farming. In the meantime, the Democratic party had changed its basic principle from a Jacksonian regard for social and political equality to promotion of slavery, after 1850 the dominant economic interest in Georgia. Thus as one party died and another shifted its position in a tardy effort to meet changed economic conditions, the division that had given zest to Georgia politics for three decades passed away. But economic sectionalism in Georgia politics remained, because it was based not so much on the careful plans of political leaders as on human needs growing out of the varying methods of exploiting the natural resources of the state. Although the lines of sectional forces in state politics changed again with the post-Civil War changes in organization and methods of agriculture and the steady growth of industrialism, the current personal political machines and the unit rule for representation of counties in party conventions and in the General Assembly are easily recognizable as slight variations from the nineteenth century devices for maintaining precarious majorities by the manipulation of sectional voting strength.²⁸

²⁸ Cf. Cullen B. Gosnell, "Rotten Boroughs in Georgia," in *National Municipal Review* (New York, 1921-), XI (1931), 395-97.

The Tennessee Whigs and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill

BY JOSEPH H. PARKS

During and immediately following the struggle over the Compromise of 1850, southern Whigs were embarrassed by the antislavery sentiments of their political brethren in the North. It was difficult for proslavery Whigs to explain away the antislavery utterances of such a political associate as William H. Seward. It was apparent that unless an end could be made to the slavery controversy, Whigs from the North and the South could not long continue to function as one party. But the activities inside the Whig circles in Tennessee during the next five years indicate that in addition to the growing cleavage between the northern and southern wings of the party there were also conflicts of opinion and interests within the southern group which finally came to a head in the fight over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854.¹

Among those who had prophesied that the Compromise of 1850 would not heal the nation's wounds was Senator John Bell, leader of the Tennessee Whigs.² By the early part of 1851, he was contemplating the formation of a conservative Union party to which could be attracted the moderates of both parties, North and South. His idea found little support even within his own state. Charles Ready, a prominent Whig of Murfreesboro, advised Bell that such a plan was "impracticable and inadmissible, if it were practicable." Conservative Whigs and Demo-

¹ For a survey of these internal conflicts in the South, with numerous illustrative references to the situation in Tennessee, see Arthur C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1913), 212-308.

² *Congressional Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 1095-98 (July 5, 1850).

crats would no more mix than "oil and water."³ Thomas A. R. Nelson, a Whig leader in East Tennessee, was quite willing to see the Whig party become the "chosen Champion of the Union," but he was opposed to changing the name. The old party must continue to stand firm in the "sturdiest hostility to the annexation of Texas and the Mexican War and the train of evils which has followed." He argued that all Whigs who had distinguished themselves in the late war could be praised while all blame for the war and the threat of disunion was placed upon the shoulders of those "nullifiers" who had sought to use the annexation of Texas as a means of building up southern strength against the North.⁴

Receiving little encouragement, Bell temporarily abandoned his new party idea and joined with other Tennessee Whigs in an effort to revive the old party by clarifying their position on the question of slavery. In February, 1852, the Whig-controlled state legislature adopted resolutions condemning the activities of the abolitionists, expressing deep devotion to the Union, and pronouncing the Compromise of 1850 the final word on the slavery controversy.⁵

As had been suggested by Nelson, the Whigs of the nation, seeking to make the fullest use of their surviving hero of the Mexican War, nominated General Winfield Scott for the presidency in 1852. When Scott failed to declare his unconditional support of the compromise, however, the Tennessee Whigs became badly confused. Congressmen Meredith P. Gentry and Christopher H. Williams, who had worked to prevent the nomination of Scott,⁶ and the eccentric East Tennessee editor, William G. Brownlow, openly repudiated the candidate. Bell begged Gentry and Williams not to break with the party, but to no avail.⁷ Bell himself gave Scott just enough support to remain regular. A continued illness prevented active participation in the campaign, but

³ Charles Ready to John Bell, January 3, 1851, in John Bell Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁴ Thomas A. R. Nelson to *id.*, January 10, 1851, *ibid.*

⁵ *Acts of Tennessee*, 1851-1852, pp. 719-21.

⁶ *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 371-73 (March 31, 1852), 709-711 (June 14, 1852).

⁷ Bell to William B. Campbell, September 3, 1852, in David Campbell Papers (Duke University Library).

he confided to William B. Campbell, governor of Tennessee, that he had "no heart in the business."⁸ The other Tennessee senator, James C. Jones of Memphis, actively supported the party's nominee. Scott carried Tennessee by almost two thousand votes, but his overwhelming defeat in the nation as a whole deprived his local supporters of cause for rejoicing.

The campaign of 1852 increased the confusion and distrust among the Tennessee Whigs; and this was especially serious in view of the fact that 1853 was the year for state elections. Gentry suspected that Jones and Bell were conspiring to destroy him politically because of his opposition to Scott. His suspicion was unfounded, but both he and Williams, sensing political isolation, decided not to become candidates for re-election to Congress.⁹ During the winter of 1852-1853 there was general talk throughout the state that the Whig party was dead. Even Bell admitted privately in February that "I think I see signs of a more decisive breaking up of our party in Tenn. in the next election than I have seen at any time heretofore."¹⁰

When the Tennessee Whigs assembled for their state convention late in April, 1853, to nominate candidates for state offices, their political outlook was gloomy. During the past two years they had enjoyed control of both the legislative and executive branches of the state government; but Governor Campbell had declined to make the race for re-election. In an effort to revive Whig enthusiasm, Bell hurried home from Washington to attend the convention. Declaring that "there must and will be two parties in every free country," he assured the delegates that there were principles and policies "closely identified with the permanent success of republican institutions, which will survive every defeat which, like the Phoenix, will continue to rise again, however crushing and exterminating their overthrow may sometimes appear." The name of the party might be changed, he said, but the fundamental principles of the Whigs would never become extinct.¹¹ Bell's opponents

⁸ *Id.* to *id.*, n.d., 1852, *ibid.*

⁹ *Id.* to *id.*, January 6, 12, February 5, 1853, *ibid.*

¹⁰ *Id.* to *id.*, February 5, 1853, *ibid.*

¹¹ Summary of speech as reported in *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, May 3, 1853.

suggested, however, that his efforts to convince the people that there was still a Whig party were due primarily to the fact that his own reelection as senator would be determined in the next session of the state legislature.¹²

The Democratic press gleefully announced the demise of "whiggery" in Tennessee, and the results of the election came near to verifying the claims. Great was the Whig humiliation when it was announced that their "Eagle Orator," Gustavus A. Henry, had been defeated by Andrew Johnson, "the plebeian," in the race for governor. In the Tennessee legislature the Whig majority was reduced to thirteen in the lower house, and the Democrats obtained a majority of one in the senate.¹³ The only consolation was in the fact that when the two houses should meet in joint session the Whigs would be in the majority. If they worked in harmony, this would enable them to continue to control both seats in the United States Senate.

The two senators were from the middle and western divisions of the state, and there was a feeling in the eastern section that the time had come for one of its sons to share this honor. When Bell's term expired in 1853, harmony might have been restored if he had agreed to step aside in favor of a man from the eastern section. His health had not been good for the past two years and he had confided to friends that he was contemplating retiring.¹⁴ The most popular East Tennessee Whig was Thomas A. R. Nelson of Jonesboro. Long a close personal friend of Bell, Nelson hesitated to oppose him, but contributed his part to the confusion by allowing his name to be put before the legislature.¹⁵ The situation was further clouded when Gustavus A. Henry assumed the attitude that his fellow Whigs should make him senator in compensation for the humiliation which he had suffered from his defeat in the

¹² Nashville *American*, May 4, 1853.

¹³ Philip M. Hamer (ed.), *Tennessee: A History, 1673-1932*, 4 vols. (New York, 1933), II, 492.

¹⁴ Bell to Campbell, n.d., 1852, in Campbell Papers; Meredith P. Gentry to Thomas A. R. Nelson, March 20, 1852, in Thomas A. R. Nelson Papers (Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville).

¹⁵ Anson Nelson to Thomas A. R. Nelson, September 1, 1853, in Nelson Papers.

race for governor.¹⁶ Henry's home was at Clarksville, in the middle section of the state; therefore, he would not be acceptable to those who demanded a senator from the east. Working through Felix K. Zollcoffer, Bell attempted to persuade Henry not to enter the race. On the other hand, Henry's friends insisted that Bell should not seek re-election. Bell replied that even if he did withdraw the Democrats would support either Nelson or Meredith P. Gentry in order further to humiliate Henry.¹⁷

Long before time for the election, Bell abandoned any idea that he may have had of retiring. A few months of vacationing in the mountains of East Tennessee improved both his health and his political ambition. As Gentry remarked, "Old veteran politicians cling to political existence with a tenacity like that of the drowning man who catches at a straw."¹⁸ In the face of opposition within his own party in the eastern and middle sections of the state, Bell realized that his hope of re-election lay with the legislators from West Tennessee, many of whom were Democrats. Since James C. Jones, his colleague, was from Memphis, that part of the state would not have a candidate in the coming election.

Taking advantage of the fact that the Southern and Western Commercial Convention was scheduled to meet in Memphis early in June, 1853, Bell deserted his mountain retreat and hastened to Memphis, where he "just dropped in to visit and listen to the convention—not to speak."¹⁹ As was to be expected, however, Whigs and Democrats alike demanded a word from him before the convention adjourned. In responding to this demand he stated that he considered the convention a great gathering of delegates from the southern geographical division of the Union, but that it should in no sense be looked upon as "contemplating offence to other sections." All sections, he said, should be interested in projects for the development of communications. He attributed the wealth of the North to its geographical position and its com-

¹⁶ Gustavus A. Henry to *id.*, August 29, 1853, *ibid.*

¹⁷ Bell to Campbell, August 14, 1853, in Campbell Papers.

¹⁸ Gentry to Nelson, March 20, 1852, in Nelson Papers.

¹⁹ Memphis *Daily Appeal*, June 10, 1853.

mercial navy, and pointed out that the surplus derived from these advantages had been invested in "improvements of the useful branches of science." He suggested that the hope of the South was the adoption of the spirit of enterprise found in the North, and expressed the opinion that nothing was quite so important in the development of southern resources as the construction of a Pacific railroad. The vastness of such a project made it national in character and importance, he explained. Therefore, government and individual enterprise should be united in the accomplishment of so great an undertaking.²⁰ This railroad speech removed all possibility of doubt about Bell's support in West Tennessee.

When the two houses of the legislature convened in joint session in October, 1853, for the purpose of electing a senator, the Whigs were still badly divided. An attempt to reach a caucus decision on a nomination failed, and the names of Bell, Nelson, and Henry were placed before the legislature. In order to avoid the appearance of complete defeat, the Democrats proposed Cave Johnson of Clarksville, a former congressman and postmaster general in Polk's cabinet. There was no hope of electing Johnson, but the division among the Whigs gave to the Democrats the balance of power. They used this power with considerable pleasure as the contest continued for many ballots, casting a few votes for one Whig and then for another, but being careful not to give any candidate enough to elect.

The three Whig candidates were on the scene and soliciting votes. "Parson" Brownlow's correspondent observed Bell "moving gracefully, but constantly through the crowd of members and citizens."²¹ Nelson's friends claimed that the Democrats promised him their support when the proper time should arrive, but that time apparently never came. After they had toyed with the Whigs as long as was desired, the western Democrats led enough votes into the Bell ranks to re-elect him. From "first to last, the Western District Democrats have been for Bell," complained Brownlow. "They have but *one idea* and that is the Pacific

²⁰ Summary as reported in *ibid.*, and in *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, June 20, 1853.

²¹ *Brownlow's Knoxville Whig*, October 8, 1853.

Railroad, and its terminus at Memphis—and Bell is their man for the scheme.” The election contributed nothing toward a restoration of harmony within the ranks of the Tennessee Whigs. Henry went home “mortified, disappointed, and mad at the whole world.”²²

While the legislature was wrangling over the election of a senator, the other members of the Tennessee congressional delegation were preparing to take their seats in the Thirty-third Congress. With the re-election of Bell the Whigs still held both seats in the Senate; but the House delegation was composed of five Democrats and five Whigs.²³ Four of the five Whigs were from the middle division of the state, and the fifth was from West Tennessee. Four of the five were beginning their congressional careers, and before the session was concluded they found themselves involved in a controversy which tried the political ability of even the most experienced members of Congress.

Bell quickly sensed the fact that President Franklin Pierce did not command the undivided support of the Democratic leaders, and he hoped to see his own party profit from the dissension which had developed. “The Whigs who are prudent will take no active part against the adminn. for the present,” he advised, “but let the elements of distraction accumulate before they make a combined attack.”²⁴ But before the Whigs could prepare for a combined attack upon the enemy, Stephen A. Douglas brought forward the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, which upset the sectional truce and doomed the Whig party as a national organization.

In its original form this bill merely provided for the establishment of a territorial government for Nebraska, but as it came before the Senate, late in January, 1854, it included provisions for the creation of the two territories of Kansas and Nebraska, left the question of slavery to be

²² William G. Brownlow to Oliver P. Temple, October 26, 1853, in Oliver P. Temple Papers (University of Tennessee Library).

²³ Whigs: William Cullom, Robert M. Bugg, Felix K. Zollicoffer, and Charles Ready from Middle Tennessee, and Emerson Etheridge from West Tennessee. Democrats: Brookins Campbell, William M. Churchwell, and Samuel A. Smith from East Tennessee, George W. Jones from Middle Tennessee, and Frederick P. Stanton from West Tennessee. Campbell died before qualifying and was succeeded by Nathaniel G. Taylor, a Whig, thus increasing the Whig total to six.

²⁴ Bell to Campbell, December 16, 1853, in Campbell Papers.

determined by the inhabitants when ready for statehood, and at the instigation of Archibald Dixon, a Whig senator from Kentucky, expressly provided for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise of 1820. Except for Dixon's insistence on the incorporation of the repeal provision, the Whigs had taken little part in the reshaping of the measure, and it soon became apparent that they were far from united in their attitude toward it. The northern Whigs were unanimous and consistent in their opposition, while a majority of the southern wing of the party seemed favorably disposed, and eventually voted for its adoption. Nowhere was the lack of southern unanimity more strikingly demonstrated, however, than in the case of the Tennessee Whigs in both houses of Congress.

Although Bell was a member of the Senate committee on territories,²⁵ by which the measure had been reshaped, his absence from Washington had prevented him from participating in the early stages of the committee's deliberations. He returned to the capital in time to make a hurried examination of the new proposal, and immediately questioned the advisability of disturbing the Missouri Compromise. He finally agreed to the incorporation of the proposed change in the report, but he did so "with the express reservation of the privilege of opposing the passage of the bill" should he, upon a more careful examination of its contents, consider it his duty to do so.²⁶ Having made this reservation he then proceeded to maintain a studied silence until the closing hours of the Senate debate on the bill.

Senator James C. Jones, on the other hand, became involved in the discussion during its early stages. He was among those who had been informed in advance of Dixon's proposed amendment to repeal the Missouri Compromise, and he had expressed himself as amazed but pleased.²⁷ Thus when such antislavery champions as Salmon P. Chase,

²⁵ The other members of the committee were: Stephen A. Douglas, chairman, Sam Houston of Texas, Robert W. Johnson of Arkansas, George W. Jones of Iowa, and Edward Everett of Massachusetts.

²⁶ *Congressional Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 408 (March 3, 1854). According to Edward Everett, both Bell and Sam Houston were absent when the committee on territories had the original bill up for consideration. See Paul R. Frothingham, *Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman* (New York, 1925), 353.

²⁷ Mrs. Archibald Dixon, *The True History of the Missouri Compromise and Its Repeal* (Cincinnati, 1899), 443.

Charles Sumner, and Benjamin F. Wade launched a vitriolic attack on the proponents of the repeal, he reacted with a spirit akin to that of an author. Wade made an especially bitter speech on February 7, in which he asserted that the Missouri Compromise had attained "a character not much less important or sacred than that of the Constitution itself," and predicted that nothing short of dire calamity would result should the proslavery forces succeed in destroying this sacred agreement.²⁸

Jones immediately branded this speech as a "tirade of abuse and denunciation," and declared that while he had worked side by side with Wade in an effort to uphold the principles of the Whig party, that cooperation ended when Wade began an attack on the rights of the people. It had never been a principle of the Whig party, he argued, "to inveigh against the institutions" inherited from the fathers of the country; and he added: "I utterly repudiate and scorn . . . I spit upon and despise any such doctrine as that, when applied to the Whig party." Referring to the prediction that the wrath of an "indignant and outraged people" would overwhelm and destroy those who were so base as to conspire to upset the sacred compromise of 1820, he said that no aggression against the North was intended but that the South was conscious of its rights and meant to maintain them. "Do not try to scare us out of them," he warned. "Reason with us if you will, but, for Heaven's sake, do not *alarm us*." The remainder of his speech consisted of an argument against the Missouri Compromise, in which he asserted that "the doctrine contained in the act of 1820 directly invades and positively infringes upon the rights and sovereignty of the States." While he respected the great men of the past whose names had been connected with the arrangement, he believed that the repeal was a question for the living to decide. As a senator, therefore, he intended to represent his constituents correctly, and to do this, he said, "I must vote for myself, and not for the dead."²⁹

This indication of a clash between northern and southern Whigs was a source of much satisfaction for the Democratic press in Tennessee.

²⁸ *Congressional Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 337 ff. (February 7, 1854).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 340-43 (February 7, 1854).

The Nashville *Union and American* had predicted that as soon as some question involving the finality of the Compromise of 1850 should arise in Congress, Whig unity would no longer exist. It deprecated the revival of the slavery controversy, but was pleased to see "a touchstone applied to whiggery." The editor further predicted that support of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill by the southern Whigs would put an end to their alliance with free-soil Whigs and destroy the party. He added that any person who aspired to the presidency would do well to watch his step with regard to this bill, and that Senator Bell would therefore be on his guard.³⁰

Senator Jones' friends in the Tennessee legislature quickly rallied to his support. On February 27, H. R. Lucas presented a resolution in the lower house expressing approval of the course pursued by Jones in his support of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. E. James Lamb, a Democrat, immediately offered a substitute approving the bill and declaring the "principle contained in said bill in regard to the question of slavery to be just, equitable, and in conformity to the federal constitution, to the treaty by which said territory was acquired, and to the compromise of 1850." Lamb further proposed that Tennessee's senators be instructed and the congressmen requested to give the bill "their zealous support."³¹

While these resolutions lay on the table, the press took up the discussion. The *Union and American*, a Democratic paper, not wishing to give any endorsement to a Whig senator, denounced the Lucas resolution as "entirely personal and invidious." It approved of the substitute offered by Lamb.³² The Nashville *True Whig* came out in support of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. But the *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, a supporter of Senator Bell, was not yet ready to endorse the position taken by Jones or to give its unqualified approval of the bill before the United States Senate.³³ Bell had not yet committed himself, and until he did, this paper considered the bill as being in too much of a state of immaturity to justify the instructing of senators. This position

³⁰ Nashville *Union and American*, February 9, 1854.

³¹ Tennessee *House Journal*, 1853-1854, pp. 979, 1094-95.

³² Nashville *Union and American*, February 28, 1854.

³³ *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, March 4, 1854.

was denounced by Lucas, who declared the editor of the *Banner* to be only "a fossil remain of whiggery."³⁴

On March 4, the resolutions were called up in the house and tabled. Meanwhile, Joel J. Jones, a Democrat, had introduced in the state senate a set of resolutions similar to those offered by Lamb in the house, and these were quickly passed by a vote of 20 to 1.³⁵ When they were taken up for action in the house, only forty-seven members were present and voting. These voted approximately three to one in favor of the resolutions. But the presence of fifty members was required for a quorum. The Speaker ruled, therefore, that since no quorum was present the resolutions were defeated and the proceedings were void, and the clerk was instructed not to record them in the journal.³⁶ It is evident that Bell's friends, not wishing to embarrass him with instructions or endorsements, were responsible for the defeat of these resolutions.

Meanwhile, in Washington, Senator Bell maintained his silence. By the latter part of February the debate in the Senate had become exceedingly warm. Douglas, pushing the bill with all of his power, had met with strong opposition from Chase and Sumner. The Washington *National Intelligencer*, which was considered by many to be the mouthpiece of the Whigs, came out in opposition to the bill. Southern Whig leaders became worried, and apparently under the leadership of Robert Toombs, they were called into caucus. Two things were to be done. Pressure was to be put on the *Intelligencer* to change its attitude, and those southern Whigs who had not committed themselves were to be lined up in support of the bill.

Both Jones and Bell attended the meeting, but Bell, suspecting a trap to force him to commit himself, left without taking a seat. The caucus adopted a resolution authorizing Senator George E. Badger of North Carolina to state on the floor of the Senate that the southern Whigs were united in support of the principal features of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. The caucus also appointed Bell as one of a committee of three to confer with the editors of the *Intelligencer*. Bell later stated that he

³⁴ Nashville *Union and American*, March 5, 1854.

³⁵ Tennessee *Senate Journal*, 1853-1854, p. 713.

³⁶ Nashville *Union and American*, March 9, 1854.

never served on any such committee, and that he had not authorized Badger to commit him in favor of the bill.³⁷

Bell did not break his silence until March 3. In an extended speech on that date, he explained to the Senate that he was not convinced of a need for the creation of any new territorial governments. In the vast territory which it was proposed to organize, there was "no white population to demand the protection and security of a territorial government." According to his information, as late as the past October there were only three white persons in the territory, exclusive of officials, soldiers, missionaries, and traders. Neither was he convinced that the deficiency in good land in the border states was so great as to produce "a necessity for this measure arising from the pressure of population." To the sponsors of this grand scheme he wished to say: "Wait a season; be not so impatient to build up a great northwestern empire. In due time all your great plans of development will be accomplished, without any great sacrifices of any kind, and without conflicting with any other great public interests. . . . In a very few years the advancing lines of settlement on both sides of the Rocky Mountains, but moving in adverse directions, will meet, overtake, and destroy both the buffalo and the Indians in their last retreat." But until that time came, he contended, the government should not take a step that would violate the agreements entered into with those Indian tribes which had moved to western lands.

Following this digression on the Indian problem, Bell returned to the main theme of his speech by revealing to the Senate that a number of his southern friends had stated in "private and friendly conversation" with him that any man from the South who failed to support the Kansas-Nebraska Bill would be a traitor to the interests of his section. They had told him that, regardless of scruples, he must offer no objection to the passage of the bill; but he was not willing to go that far until the question had been given a fair consideration. He would agree with the advocates of the bill that its passage would be in keeping with the prin-

³⁷ See remarks by Toombs and Bell, in *Congressional Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 755-58 (May 25, 1854), and 938-48 (May 24 and 25, 1854).

ciple of congressional non-interference which had been established in 1850; that the restrictions set up in the Missouri Compromise were in violation of the cession treaty with France; and that the compromise was unjust to the South. Likewise he was compelled to agree that Congress did not possess the power to establish the restrictions incorporated in that compromise. At the same time, he must admit that the compromise had been accepted by the South. On the other hand, it had never been acquiesced in by the abolitionists and the "more mischievous type of anti-slavery agitators." Such men as Chase and Sumner, he charged, had already shown in the Senate that they repudiated all compromises and would never cease their agitation until slavery should be abolished in all of the territories. They professed no war on the Constitution, he said, but they would not hesitate to destroy it if that should become necessary in order to destroy slavery. In view of these facts, he questioned "the expediency of disturbing the Missouri Compromise under existing circumstances." He could see no "practical advantage or benefit to the country, generally, or the South in particular."

On the other hand, Bell continued, he saw possibilities of even greater danger to the interests of the South if the bill should be passed. Suppose, he suggested, that one of the territories created by the bill should immediately pass a law establishing slavery. Would the North quietly acquiesce, he inquired, or would the passage of such a law sound the "tocsin for a general rally of all the worst elements of the Abolition faction . . . stimulated and supported by numbers of northern citizens who have heretofore given no countenance to their excesses?" Even if no such law should be passed, would not the mere repeal of the Missouri Compromise cause a "deep-rooted hostility to slavery and the whole South"? He said that he was not especially concerned over the group to which Chase and Sumner belonged, because regardless of what happened, they would continue their agitation. Indeed, he suspected that nothing would disappoint them quite so much as the defeat of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. The group about which he was concerned was composed of the "sober-minded and reflecting" people of the North who, although opposed to slavery, had taken no part in the ravings of

the abolitionists. Those people had no desire to violate any engagements or to withdraw constitutional protection from slaveholders within the states, but they were decidedly hostile toward the extension of slavery into territory which heretofore had been designated as free, and he feared the consequences if they should be stirred to action.

Granting that the Missouri Compromise had been unjust to the South, Bell pointed out that the extent of that injustice was the prohibition of slavery north of the compromise line, a region to which slavery was not adapted. It was his prediction that slavery would never be established in Kansas, and that even Missouri would "eventually give up her slaves to Texas and other regions where the soil is better adapted." Of what value to the South, therefore, he asked in conclusion, would be the establishment of the principle of non-intervention when there were no other territories to which to apply it?³⁸

In Tennessee, the *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, which had been advising caution until the bill could be analyzed thoroughly, now joined the opposition. Southerners had a right to take their slaves into any territory, it declared, and neither Congress nor a territorial legislature could constitutionally prevent it. Slavery could be prohibited in a territory by the people only, and that at the time of the adoption of a state constitution for the purpose of admission into the Union. The doctrine that a territorial legislature could prohibit slavery was denounced as indefensible in both principle and practice. The "squatter sovereignty" principle in the bill was no concession to the South, it said, but was "a mockery and a humbug, and not worth the South's acceptance." Slaveholders could not win in a race with non-slaveholders for the possession of Kansas. Before slaveholders "could get up in the morning, eat our breakfast, yoke the oxen, and get off the 'darkies'; the Yankees with the assistance of the squatters, would possess the land and have their quarantines established."³⁹ Taking up Bell's concluding suggestion, therefore, it stated that if the principle of squatter sovereignty should be accepted by the South, "it requires no great sagacity to

³⁸ Bell's complete speech is in *Congressional Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 408-415 (March 3, 1854).

³⁹ See issues of March 7, 8, and 9, 1854.

perceive that there will never be another slave state formed out of any territory we now possess or which we may hereafter acquire."⁴⁰

Meanwhile, however, the Senate, after adopting an amendment offered by John M. Clayton of Delaware, limiting suffrage in the proposed territories to citizens of the United States,⁴¹ had passed the bill on March 3, by a vote of 37 to 14. Jones obeyed the decision of the caucus and voted with the majority. Bell persisted in his opposition and was the only southern *Whig* to vote in the negative.⁴²

In the House of Representatives, William A. Richardson of Illinois, a Douglas lieutenant, assumed sponsorship of the bill. Over his protest, it was referred to the committee of the whole instead of the committee on territories. There it remained until May 8. This delay allowed ample time for the antislavery argument to take full effect in the free states, as well as giving President Pierce time to apply party pressure to wavering Democrats. It also gave time for congressmen to convince the people back home or be convinced by them.

The Democratic press in Tennessee, apparently unanimous in support of the bill, labored to convince the people that the bill under consideration did not provide for squatter sovereignty during the territorial stage. This resulted in a spirited controversy between the *Nashville Union and American* and the *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*. The latter, ably supported by the *Shelbyville Expositor*, stood by Bell in opposition to the bill. "Who wants the Missouri compromise repealed?" inquired the *Republican Banner*. The editor asserted that such a thing had not been thought of by the people of the South, and that since it had been proposed they had shown not the "slightest excitement in relation to the matter." To the people the thunder being "let off in Washington" was as artificial as that produced in the theatre. "President-making and party supremacy are the considerations which lie at the bottom of this most mischievous, unnecessary and uncalled for measure."⁴³

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, March 13, 1854.

⁴¹ The original bill proposed to extend the suffrage to all residents of the territory who had declared their intention to become citizens.

⁴² *Congressional Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 532 (March 3, 1854).

⁴³ *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, March 29 and April 7, 1854.

The Nashville *True Whig* and the Columbia *Intelligencer* joined with Jones in support of the bill. The *Intelligencer* explained that it did not believe Jones to be Bell's superior in statesmanship, but that in the case of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, Jones' course had been more "manly and nearer the true Southern tone."⁴⁴ What position the other Whig papers took is not known,⁴⁵ but the Democratic press, as late as May 21, 1854, pronounced them either "absent" or "not voting." The *Union and American* predicted, however, that when those papers did take a stand most of them would undoubtedly follow John Bell to the wrong side.⁴⁶

During the weeks covered by the debate in the House, Senator Bell had time to reflect upon the course which he had pursued. His position was fully explained in letters to political friends. He said that when the Whigs of the South were rushing "headlong" to join in the support of the bill, he was "really desirous of not breaking the ranks," but that when he learned that three Whig members of the Tennessee delegation in the House were also opposed to the bill, he "resolved to obey the dictates of [his] own judgment" and join them in their opposition. From the beginning, he said, he had considered the repeal proposal "most foolish and mischievous," and he now confided that he suspected Jones' support of the measure as being purely a political move. He suggested that Jones probably had not believed that Douglas would ever take up Dixon's proposal, and that when it was accepted, he had felt that he could not change his position on it. Bell also expressed to his friends a belief that most of the southern support of the bill came as a result of a feeling of pride in southern principles; but he suspected that a few supporters were looking for an issue on which the Union could be dissolved. He also suggested that one of the designs of the bill "was probably to put an extinguisher upon the Whig party—and as many of the Whigs of the South took the bait, it may have that

⁴⁴ Quoted in Nashville *Union and American*, May 21, 1854.

⁴⁵ Extant files of other Tennessee newspapers are incomplete for the year 1854.

⁴⁶ Nashville *Union and American*, May 21, 1854.

effect."⁴⁷ It apparently never occurred to him that railroad interests might have had some part in the origin of the bill.

The first Tennessee Whig to take a stand in the House on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was William Cullom, of Carthage. He stated that he had entered upon his second term in Congress with the expectation of seeing that body act upon such important matters as the construction of a transcontinental railroad, improvement of rivers and harbors, and the distribution of the public lands. Instead, he had been greeted with "this nefarious project—the work of politicians, and the effect of which is to strangle legitimate legislation of the country for their personal and party aggrandizement." He was told that he should vote to repeal the Missouri Compromise, the work of our "patriotic fathers . . . and a measure which was passed in times of great public peril" for the purpose of calming sectional animosities and which had produced "happy results." Cullom said that he considered the proposed repeal a "naked question of *repudiation* or *no repudiation* of the faith and honor of the South." Since slavery could never prosper in either of the proposed territories, the repeal would advance the interests of neither the North nor the South. He suggested, therefore, that the caption of the bill should be changed to read: "A bill to make great men out of small ones, and to sacrifice the public peace and prosperity upon the altar of political ambition."⁴⁸

Almost a month after Cullom had made his speech in opposition to the bill, Felix K. Zollicoffer, of the Nashville district, launched an extended argument in its favor. Apparently in reply to statements made by Bell in his speech of March 3, Zollicoffer asserted that the only reason why the Nebraska country had not already been settled was because the existing laws had kept people out, and denied that the proposed bill disregarded the rights of the Indians. He frankly confessed that to him the protection of the Indians was much less important than the termination of the compromise arrangement which for thirty-four

⁴⁷ Bell to R. T. Saunders, April 21, 1854, in *Olympian Magazine* (Nashville, 1903), I (1903), 351; *id.* to James McCollum, May 9, 1854, in Miscellaneous Papers, Tennessee Historical Society Collection (Nashville).

⁴⁸ *Congressional Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 538-42 (April 11, 1854).

years had denied the southern slaveholder the privilege of migrating to certain territory while non-slaveholders were free to move wherever they pleased. Stating that he had recently made a careful study of the question, he undertook to show that although the South's acceptance of the Missouri Compromise had been brought about "by wearied and worn down resistance, by dread of disunion, and by a sincere desire for peace and good fellowship with our northern brethren," that section had been more faithful in its adherence to the arrangement than had the North. He felt, therefore, that the South should now be released "from a compromise in which we made a great concession for peace and quiet, which have never been granted us."

In continuing his speech, Zollicoffer apparently sought to appeal to the other southern Whigs by insisting that the bill before the House was not a Democratic measure, but that it represented the joint labors of both parties. Although he still regarded the Whig party as the great conservative party of the nation, he said, he feared that too frequently the Whigs had permitted the Democrats to have first choice of sides on new issues, and then, "for sake of opposition," had arrayed themselves on the wrong side of the question. It was his judgment, he concluded, that "the bill is eminently sound and national, and of vital importance to the South; that if it passes, all agitation will soon quiet down; . . . that if it fails (the territories remaining without organization), the question will be . . . coming up in the next Congress, and in the next presidential election with gathering force, until justice is finally conceded to the South."⁴⁹

Charles Ready, of Murfreesboro, soon joined Zollicoffer in denying that the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was a party measure, and in charging that the Missouri Compromise had been "forced upon the South by the North." But regardless of who was responsible for the compromise, he continued, it had been superseded by the principle established in the Compromise of 1850, which had been endorsed by the Whig party; and thus those Whigs who now advocated the repeal of the Missouri Compromise were standing upon their party's platform. He then pre-

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 584-87 (May 9, 1854).

sented an elaborate legalistic argument to show that the Missouri Compromise could not have been a contract between the North and the South, pointing out that in making a contract the parties must be "competent to contract; they must enter into an agreement; there must be a consideration;" and the agreement must not run counter to the law. The compromise met none of these requirements, he said, because no Congress possessed the power to bind its successors; the South received no guarantee which could be considered as compensation; variations in interpretation proved that the North and the South had failed to agree on its contents; and the restrictive feature violated the Constitution of the United States. And finally, he contended, even if it were granted that the act of 1820 had originally constituted a contract, consistent violations on the part of the North had long since absolved the South from all obligations under it.⁵⁰

Ready's speech was immediately answered by Emerson Etheridge, who represented the one Whig district in West Tennessee. Etheridge challenged the claim that the Missouri Compromise had been forced upon the South, and quoted statements made by southern participants in the earlier controversy to show that at the time they considered it "a great triumph." While he had never thought of it as a great southern triumph, he said, he wished to emphasize the fact that the South voted for it and was pleased with it until stirred by the proposal for repeal. He believed that regardless of the conditions under which it came into existence it had served long and well, and that the interests of the South as well as the peace of the Union required that it be left undisturbed.⁵¹

The last of the Tennessee Whigs to enter the debate was Nathaniel G. Taylor, from East Tennessee, whose recent election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Brookins Campbell, a Democrat, had increased the number of Whigs in the Tennessee delegation to six. Taylor was fresh from his constituents, and during a ten weeks canvass over ten mountain counties he had been able to learn the attitude of those who sent him to Washington. He told the House that he had come to

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 741-45 (May 17, 1854).

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 830-37 (May 17, 1854).

Washington prepared to vote for the establishment of territorial governments in Kansas and Nebraska, but that if such a step must carry with it the repeal of that "great healing compromise measure" he could not support it. He would never vote for a measure which was certain to plunge the country again into a great slavery controversy, he said, and he predicted that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise would rekindle "the same jealousies, the same sectional animosities which created the necessity for its adoption." After pointing out that both the compromise of 1820 and that of 1850 had been brought about because of "dangerous agitation of the slavery question," which was threatening the peace and stability of the Union, and that both had accomplished the same purpose—"the restoration of harmony and good feeling between the people of the sections," he summed up his position by saying:

I am opposed, in conclusion, to this repeal, because it benefits *no section of the Union*; because it promises *no good* even to the South, *but tears down her only reliable safeguard for the future in reference to territory*—that is, *the barrier of the line 36° 30'*; because it is offensive to the moral sentiment of the North, which it will do no good to offend and will furnish a pretext, if not a reason, for agitation in all time to come; and I oppose it, in fine, because I have . . . found in it only *abundant signs of present and future mischief*.⁵²

The supporters of the bill finally succeeded in terminating the debate on the night of May 22, and it was quickly passed by a vote of 113 to 100. Of the Tennessee Whigs, Cullom, Etheridge, Taylor, and Robert M. Bugg voted in the negative. Ready and Zollicoffer joined the four Tennessee Democrats in support of the bill.⁵³

Since the bill as passed by the House left out the Clayton amendment restricting the suffrage to citizens, it went back to the Senate for concurrence. Here Bell immediately opened another long denunciation, and when Toombs, in reply, accused him of being allied with northern agitators in an effort to perpetuate "this prohibition on his own section,"

⁵² *Ibid.*, 811-16 (May 18, 1854). The italics are Taylor's.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 1254 (May 22, 1854). Only three other southern Whigs—one from Louisiana and two from North Carolina—voted against the bill.

a heated verbal altercation occurred between the two.⁵⁴ On May 25, the Senate approved the revised bill by a vote of 35 to 12, with Bell again casting the only southern Whig vote against it.⁵⁵

Several weeks later, in a confidential letter to William B. Campbell, Bell gave a detailed explanation of the position which he had taken relative to the whole matter. He said that although he was aware that he had run a great risk of losing in Tennessee and throughout the South, his only regret was that he had not attacked the bill at the beginning.⁵⁶ He confessed that timidity and a reluctance to separate from other southern Whigs had been the cause of his earlier indecision; and he now believed that there had been an "ingeniously arranged plan" among some of the southern Whigs to force him to support the bill or to destroy him. In fact, he added, he even suspected Toombs and a few other Whig supporters of the bill of a desire to destroy the Whig party and to form a new one. Although he was not convinced that the party had received its death blow, he thought that the course pursued by the Whigs of the northern states would be the determining factor. He had confidence in the Whigs of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, but he doubted those of New York. "If these great States do not play the fool," he reasoned, "the lesser ones will be brought into moderate counsels." Probably the worst that the Whigs had to fear, he concluded, was that "the next House of Reps. will have a larger addition of abolitionists and may bring mischief upon us," by attempting to rescind the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.⁵⁷

Meanwhile, back in Tennessee the press was still arguing the merits of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. The Memphis *Enquirer* praised Bell for

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, Appendix, 938-48 (May 24 and 25, 1854), and 755-58 (May 25, 1854). A similar altercation, in which pistols were drawn, occurred in the House about a month later when William M. Churchwell, one of the Democratic members from East Tennessee leveled the same charge at Cullom. *Ibid.*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 1441-44 (June 20, 1854).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 1321 (May 25, 1854).

⁵⁶ In this connection it is interesting to note that on March 4, the day after the passage of the bill by the Senate, Edward Everett recorded the observation that "Houston of Texas and Bell of Tennessee, members of the Committee on Territories, both voted against the bill. Had they done so in committee, it would not have passed, but Bell took care to be absent at his mines, and Houston (so Douglas told me) neglected to attend." Frothingham, *Edward Everett*, 353.

⁵⁷ Bell to Campbell, August 10, 1854, in Campbell Papers.

his "manly opposition," and prophesied that his popularity would be greatly increased.⁵⁸ On the other hand, the Murfreesboro *News* denounced him as a "dough face" who had let his aspiration for the presidency overcome his loyalty to his own section.⁵⁹ The Shelbyville *Expositor* appealed to Whigs to cease their denunciation of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, lest those Whigs who had supported it should feel compelled to "defend themselves from the imputation of being duped and cheated, or of having wilfully and knowingly contributed their influence to the success of a measure injurious to their section of the Union."⁶⁰ Probably the most prophetic observation came from the pen of the editor of the *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*. "The vote in Congress on the Nebraska bill," he said, "will be the great weapon which will be used by our Democratic opponents, from this time forward . . . to cripple and destroy the Whig party in this State. . . . It will be used to defeat the re-election, as well of those Southern [Whig] Representatives who voted *for* the bill, as those who voted against it!"⁶¹

Actually, however, it is not possible to determine just what direct effect the Kansas-Nebraska struggle had upon the political careers of those Tennessee Whigs who had participated in it. Ready and Zollicoffer, who had voted for it, were re-elected to the next two Congresses and then retired. Of the four who voted against it in the House, Etheridge was re-elected to the Thirty-fourth Congress and defeated for re-election to the Thirty-fifth; Cullom and Taylor were defeated in the election of 1854; and Bugg was not a candidate for re-election. These facts would seem to indicate punishment of the opponents of the bill; but the additional fact that all six of these men were succeeded by Democrats suggests that it was the disappearance of the Whig party as a factor in Tennessee politics rather than individual positions on the bill that caused their retirement. This explanation would seem to be further supported by the fact that while Bell's opposition to the bill was used as an excuse for defeating him when he came up for re-election to

⁵⁸ Quoted in *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, August 2, 1854.

⁵⁹ Quoted in *Nashville Union and American*, June 16, 1854.

⁶⁰ Quoted in *ibid.*, June 9, 1854.

⁶¹ *Republican Banner and Nashville Whig*, June 2, 1854.

the Senate in 1859, Jones, who had supported the bill, had already been retired at the expiration of his term in 1857. They, too, were succeeded by Democrats. And in the meantime, in the presidential election of 1856 the electoral votes of Tennessee had been counted in the Democratic column for the first time since the re-election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency in 1832. Thus, even though the division of the Tennessee Whigs on the issues involved in the Kansas-Nebraska question may not have been the actual cause of the death of the party within the state, it was at least a warning sign that the end was near. And in that respect it stands out as a striking illustration within a single state of the condition of the party itself in the nation as a whole.

William L. Yancey's Transition from Unionism to State Rights

BY AUSTIN L. VENABLE

The story of William Lowndes Yancey as a "fire eater" who gave up a lucrative law practice and the comforts of home to lead the South into the uncertainties of secession and war is so well known that there is danger of overlooking the strong fight which he made against the state rights advocates at the beginning of his public career. His first political speech was made in support of the Union during the conflict over nullification in South Carolina and for the next six years his energies as editor of a newspaper, first in South Carolina and then in Alabama, were devoted to advocacy of the Unionist point of view. It is possible that a closer examination of this phase of his career and of the factors which brought about his abandonment of the Unionist cause will contribute toward a better understanding of the development of the extreme state rights sentiment in the South during the 1840's.¹

Yancey's background was such as to give him an unusual appreciation for the grandeur of the Union. He was born at Ogeechee Falls, Georgia, on August 10, 1814, of racy American stock embracing Puritans, Quakers, and Cavaliers. His paternal grandmother was a member of an old New England family, his mother was the daughter of a Pennsylvania ironmaster, and his father was a distinguished South Carolina barrister and a descendant on the paternal side of a long line

¹ Acknowledgment is made to the Social Science Research Council and to the Research Committee of the University of Arkansas for the financial aid which made possible the research for this article.

of Virginia planters.² Furthermore, although born in the South, Yancey was reared in the East, and after attending academies in New York and New England he spent the years from 1830 to 1833 as a student at Williams College.

As a young man he returned to Greenville, South Carolina, and took up the study of law in the office of Benjamin F. Perry, a friend of his father and a staunch Unionist. At this time the people of the state were divided over the aftermath of the nullification controversy. The conflict with the federal government had ended when Congress passed the compromise tariff measure and the state convention repealed the nullification act. But when the convention prolonged the controversy within the state by attempting to pass a test oath requiring paramount allegiance to the state of all civil and military office holders, the conflict became so heated that the question was referred to the state legislature. The legislative session of 1833 passed an act requiring a test oath of all military officers.³ The court of appeals, however, annulled it by a two to one decision. Since the constitution could be amended by passing an act by a two-thirds vote in two successive legislatures, the nullifiers determined to elect enough delegates in the next legislative campaign to carry the test oath through the legislature again by a two-thirds vote, and thereby make it a part of the constitution.⁴ The Unionists organized a campaign to defeat the proposed amendment. Thus the test oath became the issue in the legislative campaign of 1834.

It was inevitable that Yancey should be drawn into the controversy, for he was a patriotic young man of deep convictions, strong emotions, and fiery energy. Moreover, it was natural that he should take the side of the Unionists, for he had been reared and educated in an atmosphere

² Newspaper clipping [no title, no date], in Mrs. Mary Yancey Kees' scrap-book (Birmingham, Alabama); John W. DuBose, *The Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey* (Birmingham, 1892), 29-30; Raleigh Travers Green (comp.), *Genealogical and Historical Notes on Culpeper County, Virginia: Embracing a Revised and Enlarged Edition of Dr. Philip Slaughter's History of St. Mark's Parish* (Culpeper, Va., 1900), 81-83; Samuel A. Echols, *Georgia's General Assembly of 1878: Biographical Sketches of Senators, Representatives, the Governor and Heads of Departments* (Atlanta, 1878), 166-68.

³ Chauncey S. Boucher, *The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina* (Chicago, 1916), 295-99.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 335.

pregnant with intense nationalism. Entering the controversy in the legislative campaign of 1834, he chose the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence for his maiden speech. In eloquent language he told of the wonderful progress of the country under the Union in the short span of half a century, and of its glorious possibilities; but, he warned, "it can all be blasted and withered, in a much shorter time than it has taken to rise, by that evil genius of our land, Disunion."⁵

The young Unionist continued throughout the summer and fall organizing Union meetings, bolstering the sluggards, and inspiring the faithful. But in spite of the good work of Yancey and the little band of Unionists, the nullifiers won two-thirds of the seats in the legislature, thus gaining the power to enact the proposed amendment. In the light of this situation, the only hope for the Unionists was to create a public sentiment of sufficient strength to prevent the newly elected legislature from passing a second time the bill to amend the constitution.

The Unionists organized a newspaper campaign to arouse public sentiment against the measure. The leading paper in the movement was the *Mountaineer*, an aggressive weekly published in Greenville, the heart of the Unionist district. In preparation for the ensuing campaign the *Mountaineer* reorganized its editorial staff. Yancey, who had had experience as editor of the student paper of Williams College, was appointed editor to succeed C. H. Wells, who had rendered conspicuous service for the Union during the nullification controversy. In his retiring editorial Wells gave a brief summary of conditions confronting the state and of the circumstances under which Yancey assumed the editorial responsibilities.

Since I have had the whole charge of the paper on my hands (nearly two years) our State has been in a continual turmoil; and it appears that now, the climax is about to be capped by an odious and revolting *Test Oath*! I have done everything in my power to avert, what I sincerely believe, and have believed from the first, is intended by our opponents, viz.: a Dissolution of the Union. Every important step they have taken, seems to me to lead directly to the furtherance of that fatal object; And under such belief I have used all my humble exertions, to show the people of our once happy State the condition their

⁵ Greenville *Mountaineer*, July 12, 1834.

oppressors wish to place them in. The talents and literary attainments of the new Editor, will much better qualify him to combat the errors of the day, and to ride upon the whirlwind of strife, which seems to be gathering over our country, than myself.⁶

In the next issue of the *Mountaineer*, Yancey announced his policy in a brief "Confession of Faith":

We will advocate and advance, to the best of our abilities, the doctrines professed and acted upon by the Union Party throughout our State.—We will oppose everything savouring of Nullification and Disunion; for we do not believe that any State has the right to Nullify an Act of Congress. We do not believe in a single iota of any, or all the doctrines expressed, set forth and promulgated in the Ordinance of Nullification. We do not believe that the State has a right to require a Test Oath of its citizens; and of course, we do not believe that the State has a right to require of its citizens, the exclusive and undivided Allegiance, which this Oath demands. We do not believe that the State has a right to enact a law defining "Treason." We do not believe that the State has the right to *secede*, consistently with its present relations to its sister States. We do not believe that South Carolina is a sovereign. We do not believe in the doctrines of Mr. Calhoun, Mr. M'duffie, or Mr. Hamilton, as being sound, plausible or Republican. To sum up all, we do not believe in the efficacy or pretended constitutionality of Nullification. We consider it as *one and the same* as Disunion—as the loathsome offspring of foiled *Ambition*—of *Discontent* and of *Revenge*.⁷

The youthful agitator closed this, his first editorial, with the statement that, with the view of inciting all those who love their state and their common country, the Union, to increased exertion in their defense, he was persuaded to come forward and offer his services to the community as the future editor of the *Mountaineer*. In subsequent editorials he attacked the whole nullification movement and its aftermath, including a call which had been sent out for a convention to revise the Federal Constitution, the bill to define treason, and the test oath amendment which was being considered by the legislature.

The Unionists did not rely solely on peaceful coercion. They organized plans for rebellion and for military resistance. With conditions rapidly approaching a state of civil war, moderate leaders on both sides

⁶ *Ibid.*, November 15, 1834.

⁷ *Ibid.*, November 22, 1834.

became more conciliatory, and a compromise was effected. The committee on federal relations reported a construction of the amendment by which the oath could be interpreted as being in accord with the Federal Constitution. The test oath bill was then passed, and the treason bill was dropped.⁸

Yancey denounced this arrangement on the ground that it was no compromise and that the test oath still demanded paramount allegiance to the state. In his editorial column he said that some of his Union friends considered his action rash and felt that he should have waited for instructions from headquarters. In response to this criticism, Yancey revealed that independent character which was to determine his course throughout a long and turbulent public career. He said:

Unfortunately for such a course, we have an opinion of our own. We had the whole of the Legislative proceedings on that matter before us; and, *accustomed to think for ourselves*, we saw no reason for not openly saying what we thought, concerning a matter which materially affected our fellow citizens as well as ourselves. . . . We have received letters from some distinguished gentlemen of our Party, concurring with the proceedings of our Representatives at Columbia. We stand alone then, in our opinions on this subject,—It is with great deference and regret, that we find ourselves arrayed against so many gentlemen of our Party, with whom we have long acted and thought.⁹

This editorial practically ended the controversy over the test oath. The stubborn editor not only displayed a courteous attitude toward those who differed with him, but he pursued an eminently fair course by permitting them to explain their views in the columns of the *Mountaineer*.

Soon afterward Yancey retired from his editorial duties, married the daughter of a South Carolina planter, and immigrated to the fertile black belt of Alabama. He rented a plantation in Dallas County and engaged in farming. But his reputation as a journalist evidently followed him, for in the summer after arriving in Alabama he took over the editorial duties of the *Southern Democrat*, a party organ published at Cahawba, the county seat. Still imbued with Unionist doctrines, he

⁸ Boucher, *Nullification Controversy*, 356.

⁹ Greenville *Mountaineer*, December 20, 1834.

supported Arthur P. Bagby, a Union Democrat, against Samuel W. Oliver, the candidate of the State Rights Democrats for governor of Alabama in 1837.¹⁰

In January, 1838, Yancey became a co-partner with G. W. Clark in the ownership of the paper. In this capacity he continued his crusade against the defection of State Rights Democrats throughout the South which had followed President Jackson's bold action in regard to South Carolina. In the notice of the new ownership he announced that the proprietors, "In thus taking charge of a political journal, when there is raging, throughout the Republic, so fearful a struggle for political and personal pre-eminence as to endanger in no inconsiderable degree the very existence of the Union, . . . feel, in its full force, the deep responsibility which has been assumed."¹¹

To this period in his career Yancey had been an unconditional Unionist. He had denied the sovereignty of the state, the doctrine of nullification, and the right of secession. But early in 1838 disturbing reports, which led him to pause, study the Constitution, and consider the nature of the Union, began to reach his desk. His indignation and fears seem to have been first aroused by the abolitionist petitions which were agitating Congress and the country, and in one of his editorials he declared:

The Vermont resolutions have afforded those deluded fanatics—the Abolitionists—another opportunity of abusing our citizens, and endeavoring to throw fire-brands into the South, to gratify a malevolent spirit. They well know that they have no right to free our Slaves, or in any manner meddle with our rights, secured to us by the Constitution; but to gratify the worst of feelings, while at the same time in many instances, they endanger our safety, they press upon Congress the consideration of this subject.¹²

This editorial then went on to express a fear that there was "a settled determination, on the part of those fanatics, to form themselves into a small band of partizans," and thereby to gain the balance of power and determine elections. Should this take place, it continued,

¹⁰ Cahawba *Southern Democrat*, July 15, 1837.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, January 13, 1838.

¹² *Ibid.*, February 17, 1838.

the country would soon be subject to a despotism appalling in the extreme.

Of special interest, also, was the fact that because of the abolitionist attack Yancey had begun to find common ground upon which he could stand with John C. Calhoun, despite their sharp difference of opinion on the nullification issue. In an editorial of February 3, for example, he wrote:

The resolutions of Mr. Calhoun, on the subject of Abolition petitions, which for a while were the all absorbing topic, have been passed thru' the Senate, and will, we trust, have a tendency to allay for a time, at least, the high excitement engendered by the increasing efforts of the fanatical intermeddlers of the North. The resolutions are couched in language temperate and dignified, but at the same time decided and firm; and are precisely such as the whole South must approve. Widely as we have differed, and still differ with that distinguished statesman on some points, we can not withhold the expression of our entire approbation of his course in relation to this matter.¹³

Yancey's fears of a despotism under the cloak of the Federal Union were intensified by the action of the friends of the United States Bank. Although its fate had been settled, sporadic efforts were made to revive it, and to counteract this movement an anti-bank party was formed in Dallas County. Yancey seems to have been a leading figure in the movement. He addressed the members assembled at Cahawba "in a feeling and most eloquent strain," and he was appointed chairman of a committee to draft resolutions expressing the sentiment of the party. He reported a series of resolutions condemning the bank, supporting the President in his fight on it, and approving "well conducted State Banks."

The second resolution is especially significant because it indicates Yancey's shift in the direction of state rights. It declared:

We deem the struggle now going on between the people, and the United States Bank partizans, to be a struggle for pre-eminence between the State-Rights principles of 1798, and Federalism in its rankest state; and that in the triumph of the Bank, if destined to triumph, we would mournfully witness the destruction of the barriers and safeguards of our Liberties.¹⁴

¹³ *Ibid.*, February 3, 1838.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, June 9, 1838.

In the spring of 1839 Yancey and his brother bought and consolidated the Wetumpka (Alabama) *Commercial Advertiser* and the Wetumpka *Argus*. The next spring when Yancey took personal charge of the newspaper, he announced that it would support a policy of strict construction in national politics and a state policy of reform in banking, internal improvements, and public education within reach of every child.¹⁵

Yancey's assumption of the editorship of the *Argus* coincided with the opening of the presidential campaign of 1840, in which he believed the issue between state rights and consolidation to have been clearly drawn. Twelve years of Jacksonian democracy had destroyed the bank, provided for the extinction of the protective features of the tariff, and checked internal improvements at federal expense. Therefore if the friends of the bank, the protective tariff, and internal improvements expected to enjoy the beneficence of a paternalistic government, they must gain control of the administration at Washington, and consolidate its powers. Thus to them the selection of the Whig candidate for the presidency was an important question, and from their point of view Henry Clay seemed to be the logical choice.

Clay went into the Whig convention with a plurality of delegates, and it was generally expected that he would secure the nomination. But the final ballot revealed not only that William Henry Harrison had won the coveted prize but also that influences other than those of the bank, the protective tariff, and internal improvements were at work. The abolitionists immediately claimed credit for the defeat of the popular Whig leader. William Lloyd Garrison's paper, the *Liberator*, exclaimed: "Had it not been for abolitionism, Henry Clay would undoubtedly have been nominated. We have faith to believe that no slaveholder will ever again be permitted to fill the Presidential office in this Republic."¹⁶ Another abolition paper, Gerrit Smith's *Emancipator*, under the caption "The Harrisburg Convention," declared: "the agony is over, and Henry Clay is laid upon the shelf. And no man of

¹⁵ Wetumpka *Argus*, March 18, 1840.

¹⁶ Quoted in Wetumpka *Southern Crisis*, August 8, 1840.

ordinary intelligence can doubt or deny that it is the antislavery feeling of the North which has done it."¹⁷ Moreover, James G. Birney, the abolition leader of the West, wrote that Clay's claims to the Whig nomination were "utterly extinguished" by the abolitionists' determination to stand by the resolutions of the Albany antislavery convention pledging them to support "no one for the Presidency, or for the Vice-Presidency, who was not in favor of *immediate emancipation*."¹⁸

The fact that Harrison's vote in the convention was drawn entirely from the non-slaveholding states against the solid opposition of the slaveholding states¹⁹ seemed to Yancey to substantiate these claims. Convinced, therefore, that a Whig victory would mean a threat to slavery, he threw the weight of the *Argus* into the fight against Harrison, and established a second paper, called the *Southern Crisis*, to be used solely for campaign purposes.²⁰ In order to arouse the South he used the columns of the *Southern Crisis* to print extended quotations from abolitionist papers showing their claims with regard to Harrison's nomination. He also went on to show that the abolitionists, having defeated the slaveholding Clay in the convention, now contemplated using their power to defeat Martin Van Buren in the election, and to isolate the South, disrupt the Democratic party, and absorb the Whigs. In support of this theory he pointed out that one of their journals, the *Philanthropist*, after declaring that Van Buren's administration was essentially southern, had stated:

Should the Van Buren party, after having rested its hopes of success to a great extent on its anti-abolition warfare, be defeated, it would be the best thing that could happen for them, as well as the free states. From that moment, the party would find it expedient to cut loose from the South. The conviction would arise, that it had been leaning on a broken reed; and that there was a power at home, which it was of more consequence to conciliate than the slaveholding interest.—

¹⁷ Quoted in *ibid.*, May 30, 1840.

¹⁸ James G. Birney to Myron Holley, Joshua Leavitt, and Elizur Wright, Jr., May 11, 1840, in Dwight L. Dumond (ed.), *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*, 2 vols. (New York, 1938), I, 563.

¹⁹ For the votes by states, see *Washington National Intelligencer*, December 14, 1839.

²⁰ The *Southern Crisis* was issued from the *Argus* office on Friday of each week throughout the campaign, while the *Argus* continued to appear on Wednesday. See DuBose, *Life and Times of Yancey*, 90.

It is the vocation of abolitionists to emancipate parties from thralldom to this interest. This they can do by creating such a mass of antislavery sentiment in the free states, and so directing it, that it shall at once crush the politician, who may venture in a single particular to pander to the wishes of the slaveholder.²¹

It is probable that if Yancey could have seen some of the correspondence between abolitionist leaders during the same period his concern would have been even greater. In March, for example, Gamaliel Bailey wrote Birney that if the Whigs with the support of the abolitionists should "succeed in defeating the Democracy in the free states, who does not see at once, that the defeated party would cut loose from slavery, and begin also to shape its policy with an eye to the demands of abolitionists?"²² Other letters to Birney show that serious efforts were being made within the abolitionist ranks to prevent them from placing a candidate of their own in the race; and about the same time Joshua Giddings stated his reasoned conclusion that "the Northern Whigs are preparing to act with the Abolitionists."²³

²¹ Wetumpka *Southern Crisis*, May 23, 1840.

²² Gamaliel Bailey to James G. Birney, March 3, 1840, in Dumond (ed.), *Birney Letters*, I, 536.

²³ Wetumpka *Southern Crisis*, June 13, July 4, 1840. The abolition leaders were disturbed in their efforts to absorb the Whigs by the action of a small group of irreconcilables who had met in conventions in Warsaw and Albany, New York, and had adopted plans for putting a third party in the field. Strenuous efforts were made to persuade them to abandon the idea. Francis J. LeMoyne, who had been nominated by the Warsaw convention for the vice-presidency, wrote Birney, the presidential nominee: "I cannot sanction the proceedings of our friends in western New York, in taking the first decisive step in the organization of a national abolition party;—neither can I cordially assent that my name shall be used for that purpose." Henry B. Stanton, who was sympathetic to independent action, sensed that the majority of the abolitionists would not support it. He wrote: "I am fully persuaded that at least 19/20ths of the Abolitionists of all sides in this State [Massachusetts], are decidedly hostile to an independent national nomination this year, and will not support it if made." John G. Whittier wrote Birney, who had received also the nomination of the Albany convention, that after a "thorough examination of the question presented by the late Anti-Slavery Convention at Albany, I have come to the conclusion that it would be best for the candidates there nominated to decline their nomination." One of their practical leaders summed up the situation when he wrote that if "abolitionists resolve to stay at home, or vote for a third candidate, we are giving the whole field to slaveholders without any opposition." The electoral returns supported his diagnosis. The intransigents persisted in their efforts for a third party, but they failed to develop enough strength in any state to affect the electoral vote. Francis J. LeMoyne to Birney, December 10, 1839, in Dumond (ed.), *Birney Letters*, I, 512-13; Henry B. Stanton to *id.*, March 21, 1840, *ibid.*, 541; John G. Whittier to *id.*, April 16, 1840, *ibid.*, 555. See, also, Wetumpka *Southern Crisis*, June 20, 1840.

To Yancey it seemed clear that such a coalition of Whigs and abolitionists would put the South in a minority position, and that their program of consolidation and immediate emancipation, despite constitutional protection for property rights, constituted a positive threat to southern interests and the southern way of life. But he believed that the Constitution, with its provisions for local self-government, its system of checks and balances, and its constitutional guarantees, afforded protection for minorities in such contingencies if it were strictly and faithfully observed. Thus the logic of events forced him to take his stand squarely upon the doctrine of state rights. He saw that under a strict interpretation the Constitution afforded a splendid protection to "minorities against the domineering will of a mere majority," and that the minority position of the South demanded "of its citizens a strict adherence to the States Rights Creed."²⁴

Yancey was obviously opposed to centralization because the measures advocated by the consolidationists were detrimental to his section, but the evidence indicates that his opposition was more fundamental. He declared: "Once let the will of a majority become the rule of construction, and hard featured self-interest will become the presiding genius in our national councils—the riches of our favored lands offering but the greater incentive to political rapacity."²⁵ He had learned, apparently, that the United States was a vast empire composed of different regions with diverse economic, social, and political interests, but he believed that those interests, which were frequently conflicting, could be adjusted more equitably in a federal union than within a consolidated one.

Moreover, the study of the Constitution and the history of its adoption had convinced Yancey that it was "made up of none but specific powers granted to it by the several sovereign States that originally framed it," and "that the General Government can exercise no power which has not been expressly given to it."²⁶ Furthermore, he foresaw with inexorable logic that once the general government was permitted to exercise

²⁴ Wetumpka *Southern Crisis*, June 6, 1840.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

powers, not expressly given to it, for subsidies to industry and for the building of roads and canals, it was as reasonable to claim constitutional authority for subsidies to agriculture and labor.

Yancey foretold with prophetic insight the consequences of the application of the consolidationists' creed. He said that it would result in a "national system of politics, which makes the members of the confederacy but tributaries to the powers of the General Government—enfeebling the sovereign powers of the States—rendering almost imperceptible the lines of State sovereignty—in fact forming us into a great consolidated nation, receiving all its impulses from the Federal Capitol."²⁷ And in strikingly modern language he warned the people that, if the tendencies toward consolidation continued, the Constitution would "have its plainly marked lines obliterated, and its meaning . . . left to be interpreted by interested majorities—thus assembling every hungry and greedy speculator around the Capitol, making the President a King in all but *name*—and Washington a 'St. Petersburg'—the centre of a vast, consolidated domain."²⁸

Even after due allowance is made for the fact that these arguments were being presented in the heat of a presidential campaign, they seem to show that Yancey had completed the transition from Unionist to state rights advocate, and the surrounding circumstances indicate that perhaps the deciding factor in bringing about his shift in position was the threat that the abolitionist crusade might become a dominant force in national politics. The real test of his sincerity may be found in the consistency with which he adhered to his new position in the face of ever-growing odds throughout the remainder of his career.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, May 16, 1840.

Notes and Documents

NOTES ON THE CIVIL WAR CORRESPONDENCE OF PRIVATE HENRY TUCKER

BY HUBERT A. COLEMAN

It is perhaps safe to say that in spite of the regimentation which must inevitably accompany the creation of an effective fighting machine, few American soldiers have ever been so completely submerged as to cease to express their individual reactions to their conditions and experiences. Most of them wrote letters, some of them kept diaries or journals, and a few of them later prepared reminiscences; but because such records seemed too personal or too unimportant, many of them were not preserved, while most of those which escaped destruction remained in private possession, either unknown or inaccessible to the historian. Consequently, most of the accounts of past military conflicts in which the United States has been involved have given so much attention to generals and leaders, campaigns and battles, and the broad problems of strategy and planning that the individuality of the thousands of men who composed the armies has been all but lost from view. At the present time, however, when the rank and file of its fighting force looms large in the consciousness of the American people, it is natural that more than the usual amount of interest should be manifested in the common soldier of past wars.

During recent months several historical journals have published fragments of Civil War diaries or selections from collections of letters; and the common soldier has also received special attention in at least

two important books—one on each side of that conflict.¹ But because a wider range of personal material is needed before broad generalizations can be properly tested, the search for individual records must be continued, and such as may be found should be made available for further study. It is with that in mind that the following notes on the letters written by Private Henry Tucker of the Confederate army to his wife in 1864-1865 are here presented.²

Concerning Tucker himself almost nothing is known beyond such information as appears incidentally in these letters. He seems to have grown up in South Carolina, where he apparently belonged to that element of the white population who possessed neither land nor slaves. His writing indicates that he received little if any formal education, and yet he shows a high degree of native intelligence. One of his letters reveals the fact that he went to Texas in 1845,³ and there is also evidence among his papers to indicate that he served as a volunteer in the Mexican War.⁴ There is no clue to his activities during the next twelve years, except the death of his first wife in South Carolina in June, 1860. He became a private in the Confederate army on April 13, 1861, just one day after Fort Sumter was fired upon, and served until he was discharged at "Camp Near Richmond" on July 15, 1862, ". . . by reason of passage of Conscrip Act providing for the discharge of all those under 18 or over 35 year of age after the expiration of Ninety Days."⁵ On February 2, 1864, he was enrolled for his second tour of

¹ See especially, Bell I. Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy* (Indianapolis, 1943), and Oscar O. Winther (ed.), *With Sherman to the Sea: The Civil War Letters, Diaries, and Reminiscences of Theodore F. Upson* (Baton Rouge, 1943).

² These letters are now in the possession of Cadet J. M. Tinsley, The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina, who has generously made them available for use in this study. They were written to Tucker's second wife, Margaret Elizabeth Tucker, whom he addressed as "Dear Lizzie," and they are cited here merely by date. Those written in February and March, 1864, are from a camp of instruction near Columbia, South Carolina; all others are from Virginia, most of them being dated at Richmond. The quotations from them follow the original spelling and capitalization. There is a complete lack of punctuation.

³ In his letter of September 6, 1864, from Richmond, he speaks of having ". . . too of my old friends with me . . . Thos Chrimes and John I drove ther Mothers waggon to texas in 45."

⁴ After the close of the Civil War he seems to have applied for a federal pension for service in the Mexican War, but, so far as the available records show, did not receive it.

⁵ Army discharge, July 15, 1862.

duty with the Confederate army, and served in a regiment of South Carolina volunteers in the Virginia campaign until the end of the war.

Because he had no wife to whom he might write during his first term of service, we have no account of his reactions to that phase of his military career. In the interim between his discharge and his re-enlistment, however, he made use of at least part of his time to select himself a second wife, and she it was who saved the letters on which these notes are based. As a suitor, he proceeded to reach the point in an admittedly candid manner and asked that he be answered in the same forthright language. For instance, on January 3, 1863, he wrote: "I never Like to Suffer my Self to Love two much unless I new it was returned and when i am in your presence i can feel it a starting on me." After having received replies to some of his earlier letters, on January 6, 1863, just three days after the letter referred to above, he wrote as follows:

you requested me to be candid with you i will ef i noe my Self and i think [I] do I have moar then a common regard for you i Don't no how it mout be But i think i would be a happy man ef my Love was returnd . . . i have roat to you that i Loved you and ef you will give me the oppertunity i will prove it to you . . . i never could sea enny yous of travelin a thousen miles to git one mile . . . per hapes you have outhter lovers . . . and wish me to quit i must Submit to it for the Sooner you Stop Love the easier it is manedg and i want you to be candid with me.

Although no mention is made in the manuscripts of the date of the marriage, it may be assumed that shortly after this letter Miss Margaret Elizabeth Gaston became the second Mrs. Henry Tucker. This letter was the last of the series of love letters, and it seemed to answer the pertinent question which confronted both.

By the latter part of 1863 the manpower problem in the Confederacy had become acute, and Tucker found that he was likely to have to serve in the army again. His half-brother, who was stationed at an outpost on Sullivan's Island, suspected as much and wrote of the possibilities for Henry at his post. The letter was from J. J. Johnson, dated December 31, 1863, and it made reference in both the salutation and the complimentary ending to the fact that they were brothers. This

letter offered the prospect of a third lieutenantancy in the following phraseology: "if you have to go in Service I would Like you would come here there is a vacancy for third Lieutenant and if you was here and would offer it is Likely you mite get it for there is no smart men in the Company to Run."

Immediately following his second enlistment, Tucker spent a short time in a camp of instruction near Columbia, South Carolina,⁶ but was soon transferred to Virginia, where he was enrolled in June, 1864, "as a volunteer recruit" in Company K of the South Carolina regiment known as the Hampton Legion.⁷ Meanwhile, he had given ample evidence that he had little appetite for this second taste of the war, for he had made numerous efforts to get out of it. One of the most interesting documents in the collection is the application for exemption on the grounds that he was the overseer on the plantation of Thomas Duckett, a plantation having fifteen able-bodied field hands. This application for exemption was filed with the enrolling office on May 3, 1864. It gives a physical description of Tucker, states that there are fifteen able-bodied field hands between the ages of sixteen and fifty years, and that Thomas Duckett, owner, is not ". . . capable of managing the farm with a reasonable degree of Efficiency." It also declares that "Henry Tucker was on the 1st day of January, 1864, the overseer of the said plantation." To prove that Thomas Duckett was not able to manage his plantation, a doctor's certificate is attached which gives the state of his health as follows:

Appeared before me Dr. Johnson who deposes and swears that he has been Thos. Ducketts family Physician for eight or nine years, he further swears that Mr. Duckett is laboring under derangement of the Liver and Dyspepsia, and that he has had two falls from a Horse and that he has not intirely recovered from them. And in consequence of Disease and bodily hurt he does believe that Mr. Duckett is not capable of attending to his farm with a reasonable degree of effeciency Sworn to the 7th day of May 1864

John R. Johnson M.D.

Sworn to the 7th of May 1864

R. Gore M.L.D.

⁶ Letter to wife, February 4, 1864.

⁷ Request for leave, August 13, 1864.

It was the duty of the enrolling officer and the advisory board to pass judgment on the state of Duckett's health, and so they did in due time. On the back of the application is this notation: "May 27th, 1864. This application is disapproved. The E. O. and Advisory Board being of opinion that the owner who lives on the plantation is capable of managing it with a reasonable degree of efficiency."

This was not the first nor the last time that he made an effort to get out of the army. In fact, his first letter from the camp of instruction near Columbia, on February 4, 1864, called attention to the fact that his case rested with the enrolling officer, and added, "ef they don't git me off in the cours of 8 dayes i will be gone to Lees army." He explained in other letters up to March 16, 1864, how to proceed with getting petitions drawn up and signed and presented to the enrolling officer. His letter of March 16, 1864, shows that while it was being written, he learned that his group had been ordered to leave for duty in Virginia. Apparently somewhat crestfallen, he added: "Farwell I had all most as Soon be Ded as a live ef i had no wife ner children."

In his letter of December 11, 1864, he is a bit more resigned, but admits that trying is still worth while. He describes the situation thus:

ef the enrouling officer wase to right to the Docter for me ther would be Som chance but i recon that he is like all the rest he has his favorits to keep out but thear is nothing like trying ther has bin so much Decit pract on the Doctors that they have got so a man has to be ded all most be four they will let him off from hear.

As late as February 21, 1865, he still had hopes and directed his wife to "tell the Dr. Duckett to tell that man [w]ho ever he be ef he will Send an order hear for me to the Board of Surgents to Send me to him and that he wantes me that they will Send me to him."

It should be added that he was seeking release from the army because of ill health; and, judging from his comment while at the camp of instruction, the other men were in no better condition than he. In describing them, he said: "we have all manner of men hear in the camp it Looks like it wont be long tell they will take up the ded

and send them hear for we have Som hear that is Just a live and can drag one foot after the outhur.”⁸

That there was no glamor in this war for him is shown in practically every letter that he wrote. As described by him, it meant not only the necessity of fighting battles, but also having to get up all hours of the night during the cold, snowy weather because of frequent illness, suffering the pains of gradual starvation, and being as “Lousey as a hog.” Apparently he reached the depths when he wrote: “O Lizzie ef it was the Lords will I had rather be ded then to be in this world,”⁹ or when he said: “I considder that I am in the hardist plais that I have ever bin in all the dayes of my life.”¹⁰

His greatest anguish probably came from being separated from his family and the increasing difficulty of getting letters from his wife. In almost every letter he implored her to write more often, and after a time adopted the practice of writing at the head of each letter the number that he had written and the number received from her. There was always a wide difference between the two numbers, and on one occasion, after having received no word from her for over a month, he wrote: “Lizzie I shall send this to Mr. Duckett and ef you are a live he will give it to you and ef ded he will right to me.”¹¹ In December he rationalized: “. . . i recon you have no paper to right on,”¹² but early in January he was saying: “Right to me Every week ef I cant hear from you and the children I had Just as Soon be in the Yankes Land.”¹³

Tucker’s letters always showed a tender regard for his wife, and he frequently expressed his appreciation to Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Duckett, where he had been employed as overseer, for giving her a home with them while he was away. After hearing that she was ill, he wrote:

I pray to god that you may be Spart for ef I Should Lose you I never expect to return hom a gane for it grieves me to the hart to think that I have Surved

⁸ Letter of February 21, 1864.

⁹ Undated letter, probably written late in 1864.

¹⁰ Letter of December 18, 1864.

¹¹ Letter of August 5, 1864.

¹² Letter of December 24, 1864.

¹³ Letter of January 9, 1865.

my country like I have and then to be compeld to submit for I Sea no yous for a man wanting to live hear in this troubles Son world.¹⁴

Much later he said: "Lizzie I have had menny hard tryals to contend with but this seames like it was the hardest of all to be cut off from you and my children is one thing that grieves me to the hart."¹⁵ Occasionally he undertook to express his feelings in verse, in which the range of his vocabulary is so much greater than that of his prose as to raise a question concerning its origin. In a letter of August 8, 1864, for example, is a three-stanza poem entitled, "My Ever Dear Lizzie Tucker," which is obviously an adaptation of "The Girl I Left Behind Me." The contrast is shown most clearly in a letter of December 14, 1864, which contains a long poem entitled, "Henry to Lizzie." Two stanzas read as follows:

Deth may ride in every battle
causing terror to each Soul
Loudest thundars crash and rattle
Heaven and earth together roll
.
.
.
The tattoo beats the lights are gone
The camp around in Slumbar lies
The night with Solemn pace moves on
And Sad uneasy thoughts arise

At the end of the poem the following note is added: "Dear wife I have come as nie giveing you my feelings at Presant as I possible could do it i have bin too days on this peas and I trust you will pay good attenchion to it."

Next to his concern over separation from his family, Tucker's most persistent worry seems to have been over food. If it is true that an army's ability to move depends on the condition of its stomach, his complaints would indicate that the Confederate army could not move far. His first mention of food shows that it was quite inadequate, and toward the end of the war he virtually admitted that the men were starving. On September 8, 1864, he reported having had "a first rate

¹⁴ Letter of August 28, 1864.

¹⁵ Letter of February 21, 1865.

dinnar" consisting of "turnipes and greans and wheat bread and som katssup." Three months later, on December 11, he was still extolling the virtues of turnips: "Lizzie i have had a mes of turneps for my dinnar which is rather a treet at the presant we have hard fair here." A few days later, however, he described the food situation with frankness and added its implication for the Confederacy in the following statement:

we are hear Just as we have bin for the last month a perishing bouth man and hors . . . I have only drew one haf pound of beef in four days and I say if our Confedericy cant feed no beter then that that we are gone up and I say all thoe I am no proffet that we are a Subjugated pepal.¹⁶

In some respects he was more fortunate than many of his comrades, because the intercession of friends had obtained for him the post of driving the band wagon.¹⁷ He referred to this assignment as a promotion, and it was later responsible for his getting at least two good meals, which he describes in very appreciative language:

on the 15 of this month [February, 1865] we all went to Richmond that is the Band to Surnad carnel Orr of Southcarolina and he gave us a treet to chees lofe bread and buter and crackers and good old rye whiskey which you may gess was verrey accetable to a hungry Soldier and then we went to a verginians hous and surnaded him and he gave us of that that was good Lofe bread Buter Coffey ham Meet and whiskey plenty we had a Splendid time of it.¹⁸

Four days later, however, he was obviously hungry again; and he reflected the seriousness of the food situation when he wrote: "we are hear in camps douing not much of ennything but Starving we dont git haf a nuf to eat we git a haf of a pound of pork for three days som times and som times we dont git non . . . we will have to leave Richmond er starve one of the too is sertan."¹⁹

He was also much concerned about the alarming rise in prices, and on July 1, 1864, he wrote that he had "heard som men Say that it would

¹⁶ Letter of December 23, 1864.

¹⁷ Letter of September 6, 1864.

¹⁸ Letter of February 17, 1865.

¹⁹ Letter of February 21, 1865.

take one thousand Dollars to by one barrel afflower." On September 6, 1864, he quoted the following prices:

I have to give 100 Dollar²⁰ a pas [piece] for washing my close everything is verry hie hear a common water milon cost 10 to 12 Dollars a pas unions cost from 50 to 75 and 100 Dollar a pas butter milk 200 per Quart buttar 12 Dollars per pound flower 100 a pint cup fill papar 10 Dollars a Quier.

Another cause for repeated worry on Tucker's part was the practice of exchanging men between the different companies and regiments of the Confederate army. In the summer of 1864 he reported that he was in danger of being transferred to another command because he had failed to secure a horse when he was home on furlough; but at the same time he was trying to arrange for the exchange of one of his friends, and in reporting his failure said: "I am Sorrey that Henry [Young] did not come to hour Rigment the Man onley ast him 300 Dollars to Swap."²¹

For Tucker himself the most serious threat seems to have come in December, 1864. At the beginning of that month he wrote: "I feel a grait diel beter Satis fid then I did for they cant Swap me off they have to pronounce me a Sound man and that they cant do."²² But by December 15, the situation had so completely changed that he reported to his wife:

I have got my orders from my Lut. to hunt me a Reg. and make a Swap er i will be Swapet like a hors and by a nother year I would not be Surprised ef the privet Souldier was not Sould like a hours for confederet money never did i be live that men would Submit to what they do.²³

On the same date, December 15, the situation prompted him to write a letter of appeal to the commanding officer of his regiment, in which he stated his case in a very creditable manner, and closed by saying:

it looks very hard for me to look at it for an old Soldier that has always tried to do his duty to be Swaped off like an old horse though it may be fair I am

²⁰ He must have omitted the decimal point from some of these figures.

²¹ Letter of August 7, 1864. In view of his use of the word "onley," and of some of the figures in the preceding quotation, it is perhaps safe to assume that the amount named was three dollars rather than three hundred.

²² Letter of December 3, 1864.

²³ Letter of December 15, 1864.

forty three years of age and am willing to do Such duty as a board of Army Surgeons after examination may require me to do.²⁴

Three days later he still felt that his situation was critical, and he described it in a letter to his wife as follows:

But when I got hear I gave my Surrifficat to the major ho was in Command he sent them to the Loutenant of my comptney and they ware mad and tour them up and then sed that they intendid to send my name up with som outhers to be exchange they are a working to git all their relation that is in other Rigments in to ther Comptney by swapping off men as to the comptney i dont care to stay in it no way but I Dont intend to be tradid like some old hors if I can helpe it.²⁵

It was apparently another three weeks, however, before he could feel that his danger of being exchanged had passed, and could report to his wife that "I think that the officers has concludid to keep me for they no that I am not fit for the Survis they seem to think it will not do them enny good to swap me off."²⁶

Although Tucker's letters contain many descriptive references to military action, he admits that the newspapers are a better source of military information.²⁷ There are comments, of course, on the status of the war from time to time, and he seems to have kept fairly well informed on the developments in the other theaters of war as well as in the Richmond area. The correspondence also shows how the morale of the troops was dependent upon the military situation. For example, in 1864, when a Confederate force under General Jubal A. Early was threatening Washington from the Shenandoah Valley, Tucker wrote that "Thear is the gratist Spearit a mong the tropes at this time grant is Leaveing hear hour Scoutes repourtes that the yankes is Leaving as fast as they can to defend Washinton."²⁸ But Grant's army did not leave the Richmond area, and shortly afterward Tucker was able to

²⁴ Tucker to Colonel Logan, December 15, 1864. The spelling in this letter indicates that Tucker either took particular pains to write better than usual or obtained assistance in writing it.

²⁵ Letter of December 18, 1864.

²⁶ Letter of January 6, 1865.

²⁷ Letter of August 23, 1864.

²⁸ Letter of July 15, 1864.

give his wife the following account of a Federal charge on the position where he was stationed:

but I tell you they fight despart O what powerful Deth they caut last Evening in making a charg on hour brest workes they com Like a black cloud and they ware moad to the land as fast as they come but they still try to hale [?] the plase we have no yous for the plas that they have but they cant come no father ef they do they come on a dedline sirtan.²⁹

That one result of this combat experience was a temporary heightening of his own morale and the development of a fatalistic attitude is indicated in a statement made to his wife a few days later that "when I first come out hear I thought that I would play off But I cant do that my cochens will not Let me and I no that I will Live as long as the Lord intends."³⁰ Within a short time, however, his thoughts were turning toward possibilities of an early termination of the war, which would "let us return home to our fameles in peas never moar to be de starbed by the Sound of Cannon and Muskets." And he added, "Let our next ware be with Sin and the Devell."³¹ Before the end of the year, the Confederate situation had become sufficiently desperate to bring a general decline of morale, which, apparently, was never again checked. On December 4, 1864, for example, Tucker wrote:

Dear i will Say to you that i never have Sean as menny men dishatened in all my life and ef ther is not Som aulteration here with the officers in command i would not be Suprised to hear of Som of the men rebeling but i hope that they will not.

Within a short time he began to report individual desertions, and on December 23 he stated that "we have men a deserting constant and goin to the Yankes," adding that "the whole armye as far as I can learn is dissatisfied and is dishartened at the prospect be four them They are not a fraid of being whooped but of perishin and starvation." Meanwhile, he had apparently reached the conclusion that the Confederate soldiers would rather go back into the Union than fight another

²⁹ Letter of August 14, 1864.

³⁰ Letter of August 23, 1864.

³¹ Letter of September 1, 1864.

twelve months and gain their independence, and on December 8, he undertook to express this as follows:

I can tell you that we have a different feeling hear to what ther was when i left ef the Question was left to the Souldiers to go back in to the union as we once ware er fight on and gane hour indipendance at the experation of twelve monthes they would go back in to the Unon they have give up all hopes of ever haveing a peas a gane all thoe everything seames to be resined to ther fate as to my Self i cant express my veue a bout it I dont want to Say what I think . . . we are a ruined pepal unless the kind providence should smile on us.

Most of his letters during the remaining four months of the war reflect his hope for peace in their repeated references to the rumors which were being circulated. Just before the end of 1864 he was advising his wife to get rid of all her Confederate money.³² On January 9, 1865, he reported that "the peas nuse hase all dide a way and they are all redy to fight to the last." By January 29 there were peace rumors again, but Tucker was skeptical at first. In his letter of that date he said: "I have heard a grait menny men Say that we ware Surtan to have peas this Spring but I dont believe one word of it." After writing this sentence, however, he heard a rumor that gave him new hope, and in the same letter he said: "I learn that Mr. F. P. Blair has maid his 3 third viset to Richmond and is hear now ef so maby we will have peas Soon."

The news of Sherman's march across South Carolina again brought despair, and he reported that "I tell you hour men is whooped the wirst that they have ever bin."³³ At the same time his fear that his wife might be in the path of Sherman's army led him to offer the following advice:

ef the yankes comes up where you are you must try and take care of yourself . . . Lizzie you must hid every thing of my clo[thes] that is yankes close and my pistol . . . ef the yankes dos come and you can git the Negros to hid and claim your things as ther one [own] they can keep them for you safe.³⁴

³² Letter of December 26, 1864.

³³ Letter of February 21, 1865.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

With the surrender of General Lee at Appomattox on April 9, the peace for which Henry Tucker had hoped finally came, and on the next day he received his paroled prisoner's pass.³⁵ Apparently he lost no time in getting home to his beloved Lizzie and with the cessation of the correspondence which his absence from home had made necessary he seems to have stepped back into the obscurity from which he had emerged on joining the Confederate army.

³⁵ This pass, dated at Appomattox Court House, April 10, 1865, is among the papers. It states that "The Bearer, H. Tucker of Co. K, Hampton Legion Regt. of S. C. V., a Paroled Prisoner of the Army of Northern Virginia, has permission to go to his home, and there remain undisturbed."

Book Reviews

George Fitzhugh: Propagandist of the Old South. By Harvey Wish. (Baton Rouge; Louisiana State University Press, 1943. Pp. ix, 360. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.00.)

This is an important contribution to the study of slavery propaganda as a factor in causing the Civil War. Not strictly biographical, it traces the thought of an obscure Virginia lawyer, after the sectional crises of the late 1840's and the political revolutions in Europe of 1848-1849 turned his thinking to the defense of slavery and to southern nationalism. Fitzhugh, the son of an army surgeon of 1812 who owned a small plantation in King George County, never received a college education, perhaps because his father died when he was eighteen. Nevertheless he recalled that in the "field" school he was so proficient in Latin that when he was nine he was put in charge of the class during the teacher's temporary absence (p. 10). He read law books in the office of a prominent attorney and in his early practice was associated with him (p. 11). In 1829, when twenty-three, he married and moved to "The classical, if somewhat decayed, mansion" of his wife's people in Port Royal, Caroline County (p. 13). Thus the declining village on the Rappahannock, a thriving port in the eighteenth century, became his home four years after the death of John Taylor, whose plantation lay nearby. Mr. Wish sees the influence of Taylor on Fitzhugh (p. 14).

Fitzhugh eked out a living for his growing family by "a precarious law practice," was active in county political affairs, and from 1849 to 1872 wrote and published prolifically. In 1878, his wife dead, the family gone, he left Port Royal, moving westward to his children, first to Kentucky, then to Texas. In 1881 he died, unknown to the generation which had arisen since Appomattox (p. 340).

His propaganda began anonymously in 1849 with a pamphlet, *Slavery Justified*, "intended for a few friends" (p. 54). Though uninfluential outside the Virginia tidewater, Mr. Wish believes it of germinal importance in Fitzhugh's thought, for the ideas became much of his "stock in trade" (p. 61). In 1854 Fitzhugh published his first small book, *Sociology for the South; or, the Failure of Free Society*, sharing with Henry Hughes of Mississippi the honor of publishing the first American work entitled "sociology" (p. 40). His second small volume, *Cannibals All! or, Slaves without Masters*, was "largely a commentary

on the first" (p. 343). In 1854 he became contributing editor to the widely circulated Richmond *Examiner* (p. 78), and in 1855 secured an editorial position on the powerful Richmond *Enquirer* for the presidential campaign (p. 144). Between 1855 and 1867 he contributed well over a hundred articles to *De Bow's Review*, published in New Orleans (p. 343).

He defended slavery by attacking free society, primarily laissez faire exploitation of labor in Europe, seeing in it with the Socialists the seeds of its destruction—mass revolt and an assault on property (pp. 105, 183). His mission was to reconcile North and South by a "scientific approach" (p. 82), his remedy to identify the interest of weak and strong, poor and rich. Domestic slavery and feudal institutions "so far as they retained the features of slavery" would achieve this. He was silent as to how far he would transform free society (p. 59). He made a parallel assault on the eighteenth century Age of Enlightenment which had nurtured individualistic ideals. He rejected its doctrine of progress, all social compact theories, the Virginia Declaration of Rights, and the Jeffersonian traditions of the inalienable right to life and liberty (pp. 94ff.). Paradoxically about 1854 he declared Calhoun's doctrines exploded (p. 101). For all his extremism he did not wish to take Virginia out of the Union. He attacked free trade in large part from his desire for "an independent Virginia nationalism . . . secured by political, economic, and cultural autonomy, all within a loose federal union of convenience," and wanted a diversified South (pp. 87, 166).

While the southern press praised and defended Fitzhugh's writings, one concludes (though Mr. Wish makes no such statement) that Fitzhugh's real significance was his influence on the North. His works were grist to William Lloyd Garrison's mill. Quotations sometimes filled a column. *Cannibals All!* roused Garrison to fresh extremes of vituperation, receiving "considerably more attention than perhaps any other book in the history of the *Liberator*" (p. 200).

Mr. Wish considers the "scores—perhaps hundreds—of unsigned editorials" in the *Examiner*, 1854-1856, and the *Enquirer*, 1855-1857, which he traced to Fitzhugh chiefly through internal evidence, of prime importance because of their extensive circulation, reaching the critical eyes of Sumner, Lincoln, "and many others of note who regarded the extreme sentiments of the editorials as typical of the South" (p. 344). He believes Fitzhugh added "definitely to that caricature of the Southern mind which impressed the antislavery forces as a product of the slaveholder's diabolism" (p. 213). He points out the similarity of Fitzhugh's "house divided" doctrines in *Sociology for the South* (1854), and in the *Enquirer* editorial, May 6, 1856, to those of Lincoln and Seward, and Lincoln's acknowledgment in Cincinnati, September 17, 1859, of the expression of that idea in the *Enquirer* "quite two years before it was expressed by the first of us" (pp. 104, 151).

Apart from this decisive influence, Mr. Wish leaves at least this reviewer confused as to his exact estimate of Fitzhugh. The preface states: "Further study of Fitzhugh ultimately convinced me that here was no ordinary slavery propagandist, but a challenging observer of his milieu who conceived of a national issue in terms of a world historical setting, reviving the timeless human problem of freedom versus organization, of liberty versus order, and of experimentalism versus authority. . . . The question of Negro slavery, he often repeated, was but incidental. . . . The world must choose between the security of the feudal ideal, and the chaos of liberalism. . . . there is little doubt that his 'system' belongs within the ideological orbit of contemporary Fascism. From Fitzhugh to Mussolini the step is startlingly brief."

The text presents a retiring although genial man of limited experience who "had traveled but rarely outside of tidewater Virginia" (p. 19); who was an avid reader despite little classroom education; but who wrote: "I'll make a clean breast and acknowledge my pseudo-learning is all gathered from Reviews. . . . Newspapers, novels. Reviews are the sources of my information" (p. 20). Mr. Wish says: "He acquired the easy confidence of the self-educated despite the apparent shallow basis of his fund of knowledge, particularly in economics and *belles-lettres*" (p. 10). He appropriated expressions and ideas from Thomas Carlyle, especially the broad conception of slavery as coercive labor in any of its forms which he made his "slavery principle" (p. 76). His title *Cannibals All! or, Slaves without Masters*, and much of the text, came from Carlyle's idea that the unemployed under competitive Manchester Liberalism were "'slaves without masters' sunk in a species of cannibalism" (p. 74).

One sees a facile, untrained mind cramming the British reviews, "largely Tory, or at least moderately conservative Whig" (p. 20), so widely subscribed to in the Old South. Curiously detached for a defender of slavery, perhaps because not primarily a slave owner (p. 10), he apparently wrote to satisfy literary ambition and for the fun of it, unaware of the fire he was lighting. Mr. Wish cites no histories that he read. Comparison with contemporary British reviews might show the precise sources of his ideas on sociology, *laissez faire*, socialism, and of his "historical analysis." Mr. Wish states: "He was ever to be far more specific in dealing with European trends than when discussing the affairs of South Carolina or Mississippi" (p. 20); he was not primarily interested in the reform of free society "but rather in demonstrating its inferiority to chattel slavery" (p. 59). The "Preface" is therefore confusing in its implication of Fitzhugh as an original thinker when the text reveals a propagandist seeking the thought of other men in current publications to weave a defense of slavery.

One regrets the author's failure to tie up at the end his conclusions; also his unawareness of the rise of Virginia manufacturing industry and all that it

signified, especially democratic economic opportunity. Port Royal and the Northern Neck across the River, like much of Russia, skipped the railroad age. Only with the coming of the automobile did they return to the main current. But as already stated, Mr. Wish has made a valuable contribution.

Newcomb College

KATHLEEN BRUCE

The Growth of American Thought. By Merle Curti. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943. Pp. xx, 848. Illustrations, bibliography. \$5.00.)

The term "American Thought" is rather vague. It can refer to little or to much. Vernon L. Parrington applied it primarily to literary expression. Charles A. Beard centered it about the single idea of civilization. Ralph H. Gabriel used it to analyze a limited group of men and movements. Mr. Curti takes a broader view. He attempts to find the dominant patterns which characterized different eras of American history and to relate them to social-economic forces and to each other. The result is encyclopedic with little of the keen penetration and suggestive approach of Parrington or Beard or Gabriel. The framework is excellent. The material supporting that frame is in most cases somewhat sketchy and shallow. Many men and many movements are mentioned with some excellent information and interpretation but, somehow, no individual and no movement is quite satisfactory to one who knows more than an average amount about that individual or that movement. Mr. Curti has produced the kind of book which one wants on his work-desk—the kind for which one is thankful to the point of being somewhat ashamed when asking for more than it contains.

The book is organized chronologically into eras, each with its dominant thought flavor. Thinking in the colonial period was the product of the interaction of an old world heritage and a wilderness. It is largely a story of adjustment—a conflict between the forces of persistence and those of change. The Revolutionary era saw the rise of "Americanism," a term which covers both liberal and conservative tendencies and indicates the beginnings of cultural nationalism up to 1800. The nineteenth century is divided into four eras: the first marked by patrician leadership and challenged by frontier forces; the second dominated by democratic upheaval and running to 1850; the third characterized by the triumph of nationalism and business ideology in social and political thought; and the fourth, beginning around 1870, notable for the assertion of individualism "in a corporate age of applied science." After that American thought became more critical, sometimes even cynical, and a realism, sharply contrasting with the earlier romantic tendencies, developed among more advanced thinkers.

Mr. Curti finds that writings on theology, science, literature, education, social reform, and national consciousness in each period reflect or contribute to the larger trends of the day. Thought is set in the social order as it evolves and is

not left as a dangling abstraction born out of the "nowhere into the here." There is less of the straining of facts to make them fit patterns than in Parrington; but there is also much less of clear-cut analysis of thought and thinkers in their own right than in Gabriel. It is a choice that the author's method forces upon him. It gives, as has been said, scope rather than depth and leaves a sense of disappointment which is not entirely overbalanced by gratitude for the abundance of material presented. One cannot but wish either that the great movements in American life had been so well understood that penetration would have been present even in brevity or that a less extensive canvas had been chosen so that the inside of some significant American thought developments might have been more satisfactorily explored. And yet what right has a reviewer to draw plans for an author or to ask for more when so much has already been given?

University of Chicago

AVERY O. CRAVEN

Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy. By Charles W. Ramsdell. Edited with a Foreword by Wendell H. Stephenson. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1944. Pp. 136. Portrait, bibliography. \$2.00.)

The Louisiana State University has rendered a service in publishing the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures given by the late Professor Charles W. Ramsdell at that institution in 1937. We have here the mature, wide, and penetrating thought of one of the foremost historical scholars of the South on a subject of peculiar southern interest. The reader feels throughout the three long chapters into which the lectures are organized the hand of the master, holding firmly in his grasp the many, intertwining threads of his subject.

In the absence of documentation it is difficult to be certain whether the author has introduced any fresh material, but the work has value primarily by virtue of its analysis, synthesis, and interpretation of facts in an effort to solve a problem. It is avowedly not his purpose to answer the broad question of why the Confederacy failed to achieve independence; he is not here interested in the military aspects of the problem, for the larger population of the North, the larger armies, and the greater navy with its ability to establish an effective blockade of the southern coast while it kept open the northern ports are not the subject of this study. Instead, the author devotes himself to a scrutiny of the problems behind the Confederate lines, the problems of the civilian population, which he recognizes as extraordinarily difficult—so difficult that Confederate officials never solved them.

The civilian problems lay chiefly in the realm of finance—debts, irredeemable paper currency, and inadequate gold reserves, with constant depreciation of the currency; in the high cost of living; in the problem of transportation with its inherent enormous difficulties; in illicit trade with the enemy, which inevitably

brought demoralization; in the methods pursued in exemptions; and in the system of impressment, one of the worst of the evils, according to Ramsdell, because it undermined loyalty to the Confederate cause. All the above summed up by 1865 into administrative collapse.

Efforts by the central government and by the states to solve these difficult problems brought a tremendous extension of governmental authority, an intrusion into the domain of state rights to a degree which seems extraordinary in view of the political philosophy of the South and in view of the grounds on which these states seceded. The failure of these expedients proves how likely is failure when the attempt is made to set up a new administrative system in an emergency.

There is some repetition, even to almost identical phraseology (cf. pp. 39 and 57), and much recurrence to the same subjects in the various chapters, but the latter is probably inevitable in a method which traces chronologically the internal decline of a state. On the whole the author is moderate, citing not the extreme prices, as he might easily have done, to indicate the terrible inflation; and he is fair, pointing out robberies perpetrated on their own people by local cavalry (p. 55) as well as cruelties by northern soldiery (p. 56.) It is regrettable that he could not fulfill his purpose of documenting the work, for it would then be more useful to young scholars, while the older workers could follow up certain statements instead of perhaps mentally challenging them. Certainly, the ripe scholarship of a master is present in his sound conclusions. He points out that the Richmond government moved steadily toward ever-increasing control over the individual because it *must* in its desperate effort for survival. He points out the shift in dealing with relief from local to state control and from a money basis to direct distribution of provisions. Though he fully recognizes the grave importance of the financial question—and is at his best in dealing with it—he does not underestimate the significance of other factors. He finds complete failure in solving this problem; he condemns impressments as failing to check inflation, at the same time that they aroused resentment instead of inspiring loyalty. He is cautious, even after more than three-fourths of a century, in suggesting solutions for these problems which confronted Confederate officials, thus affording a contrast to their own contemporaries, who were ever ready with criticisms and proposals of solution. There are some infelicities in style which the author would undoubtedly have removed if he had been able to revise the manuscript to his satisfaction.

No reviewer should fail to comment on the illuminating foreword by Professor Wendell H. Stephenson, giving a sketch of Dr. Ramsdell's distinguished career and affording an insight into his method of working which enables one to feel as if he, too, had handled the manuscript. Finally, a bibliography of the author's writings, prepared with the assistance of Dr. Eugene C. Barker, as an appendix, impresses the reader with the amount and scope of the productive

scholarship of this eminent historian. He lays down the thin volume with renewed regret that Ramsdell postponed too long his projected history of the Confederacy.

Goucher College

ELLA LONN

A Collection of Hayne Letters. Edited by Daniel Morley McKeithan. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1944. Pp. xx, 499. \$3.00.)

Professor McKeithan has brought together in this volume 229 letters written by Paul Hamilton Hayne, 11 by his wife, and 5 by their son; and he has supplied in explanatory notes information as carefully detailed as any student has a right to expect. A brief "Foreword" sketches Hayne's career and explains the editor's plan of organization and method of work. After careful deliberation, he says, he elected to classify the correspondence in terms of the twelve libraries in which it was found, a method which enables the reader "to examine as a unit the letters addressed to the same person." This procedure, of course, has its advantages when considered abstractly, but in Hayne's case it seems particularly inappropriate because, except for those to William Gilmore Simms, the letters all seem to orchestrate a similar broad theme—the theme of the poet's poverty, his loneliness, his curiosity regarding fellow craftsmen in the North, and of the hostility or indifference of southern readers toward his persistent efforts to interest them in poetry. The chronological arrangement which Dr. McKeithan discarded would have provided in a sense the basis for a biographical comprehension of Hayne—something which, in view of the absence of a definitive life, is badly needed.

One other point concerning method also calls for further consideration. In only one instance, apparently, did the editor visit a library personally and do his own investigating of the original materials. In seven cases he depended upon the library authorities to provide him with microfilm copies, in three with photostats, and in one with typed copies of the letters. Perhaps this was the only possible procedure under the circumstances and we should be grateful for what we have. Yet the assumption that librarians are altogether responsible people—in the sense that they know fully both the nature of their own acquisitions and the interests of those who ask them for assistance—is dangerous. To cite one striking illustration of the danger, attention may be called to the large collection of Hayne's letters to Bayard Taylor in the Cornell University Library, of which no mention is made in this volume. But Professor McKeithan expresses his gratitude to the librarian "for typed copies of the Hayne letters in the Library of Cornell University," which prove to be forty-four letters to Moses Coit Tyler. In response to an inquiry from the reviewer as to why Professor McKeithan had not used the Taylor letters, the librarian replied that he had "asked us to have the Hayne-Tyler letters copied for him," and that "he probably did not know that we had

the Bayard Taylor correspondence . . . and that Hayne had written letters to Taylor." The "Foreword" makes it clear, however, that the editor did know that Hayne and Taylor corresponded, and he could have discovered in the biographies of Taylor the present whereabouts of that correspondence. The librarian adds that "although there is an index to the Taylor papers, we did not consult it when we looked up the Hayne-Tyler letters for Professor McKeithan." The moral, it might be suggested, is that there is no complete substitute for a first-hand examination of manuscript material. The Bayard Taylor letters belong logically in the present volume, and if the editor had some special reason for omitting them he should have protected himself by stating the reason.

As for the letters themselves, there is negligible literary distinction in them, but they tell us a good deal about Hayne. During the period covered by the majority of them, he was a lonely, poverty-stricken poet, living in a shanty called Copse Hill, near Augusta, Georgia, with a wife and two children. His garden, an income of approximately \$400 annually—half of which went for taxes on Charleston property—and what he received for poems and essays enabled him to support life and to keep handy a supply of comforting "mountain dew" with which he often tempted his friends. He was alternately bitter and indifferent toward political issues. He despised Charleston. Typical of the South, it "compelled a poet to publish *abroad* if he desires his vol. to receive the slightest degree of attention."

Why did the South ignore Hayne? The question is an old one, but the explanation should by this time be clear. He was not ignored. He received all the attention he deserved. Moreover, the people of Charleston bought his books more freely than they were bought anywhere else in the country. In large measure he was a derivative poet, striving for polish and grace, either imitating or refining upon the performances of second-rate contemporaries in the North. In his youth he was neglected because the gifted people of his section were preoccupied with desperate political emergencies (Calhoun, had he been permitted to develop as a poet, would probably have been a Homer). In his later years Hayne had little to say to his people; their problems did not interest him.

The reason he had little to say is made plain in these letters. He lacked a critical sense, either of his own work or that of others. "I never take up your poems without having some chord of my poetical nature touched . . . by the breath of a beautiful inspiration." Thus he wrote to Richard Henry Stoddard, over whose "purity of artistic finish" he never tired of exclaiming. Again, "Your poetry elevates the spirit . . . had you lived in ancient Greece, Mr. Longfellow, I think they would have called you a favorite of the gods," a remark which as criticism is on a par with his statement to Edmund Clarence Stedman that his studies of Browning and Tennyson were "unrivalled in *philosophic* insight," or with his poem on the dead Bayard Taylor, in which that derivative poet is pictured as being welcomed by Goethe to some serene abode inhabited

by Homer, Shakespeare, and Aristophanes: "Come! we share the self-same height." Obviously an author incapable of distinguishing between the achievement of Taylor and that of those worthies would be incapable of analyzing his own verses. Yet in some general way his readers made the analysis for him and decided quietly to neglect what he wrote. Posterity has confirmed their judgment. Hayne is important today not through the intrinsic merit of his literary performance but as a study in the history of taste. We should be grateful to Professor McKeithan for collecting the materials which make this study possible.

Vanderbilt University

RICHMOND CROOM BEATTY

The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943. By James Benson Sellers. *The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1943. Pp. x, 325. Bibliography. \$1.25.)

This volume traces the efforts to regulate and to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in Alabama from French colonial days to the present. In the colonial and territorial periods as well as the early decades of statehood, the action taken was designed to prevent the sale of intoxicants to and by persons unable to handle them wisely and to make the traffic provide revenues for public use.

In the 1820's a temperance movement was well under way in Alabama. The Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians of the state led in this movement, which was at first mainly an appeal to abstain from drink, together with a campaign of education regarding the evil effects of liquor. Prior to the Civil War, the movement was converted into a crusade to restrict the sale of alcoholic beverages; and after the war it continued to grow until the power of the state over the liquor business was extended to local option, and finally to statewide prohibition in the early twentieth century. In 1909, the temperance forces made an unsuccessful attempt to write prohibition into the state constitution. This was followed by a reaction resulting in five years of local option. In 1915, Alabama again returned to the dry column to remain until 1937, when it adopted the state liquor store system.

The Prohibition Movement in Alabama is a useful factual addition to the literature for the study of the work of pressure groups in securing control of governmental forces. In the long and bitter struggle between opposing forces, first one side and then the other was in the ascendancy without either side ever being the complete victor. The author has presented in meticulous detail the co-ordinated efforts of state and national leaders for and against prohibition and has managed to remain fairly detached throughout the study. He has told the story mainly by amassing the views and the work of leaders on both sides of the question. In dealing with such a highly controversial topic, this method of presentation may have its merits, but the reviewer feels that the author has

failed to meet an obligation to the reader in not giving more synthesis, interpretation, and integration. The citing of sources of information in footnotes is overdone. In a study of this type, for example, such commonplace information as the date of Alabama's admission to the Union does not need a citation. In general, one reads the book with a feeling that less haste in getting into print and more thoughtful attention to the meaning of the mass of facts here presented would have resulted in a more scholarly and useful contribution.

Western Kentucky State Teachers College

CLARENCE P. DENMAN

One Hundred Great Years: The Story of the Times-Picayune from Its Founding to 1940. By Thomas Ewing Dabney. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1944. Pp. xii, 552. Appendix. \$4.00.)

"How can one tell the history of a newspaper without telling the history of its community?" asks Mr. Dabney in the preface to this meaty volume. And how, he adds, can one understand the history of a community without knowing the history of the state, the nation, and, to a large extent, "the world developments which gave it motivation and background"?

He evidently asked himself these same questions on January 25, 1937—the one hundredth anniversary of the New Orleans *Times-Picayune*—after he had completed the writing of two hundred and forty columns of historical matter for the paper's centennial edition. And, unlike the usual editor of such an edition, he set out to find the answers.

This book, the product of five years of intensive research, writing, and re-writing, is the result of his labors. The title properly emphasizes the period covered rather than the newspaper studied. For the book is, indeed, not so much the history of a paper as the history of the times as reflected in the columns of that paper. Since America has few more colorful cities than New Orleans, the story told is bound to be an interesting one.

A few of the one-word captions which appear over the fifty-three chapters of the book will indicate its contents: Challenge, Struggle, Crisis, Whistling, War, Reconstruction, Pestilence, Mafia, Lottery, K. K. K., Sugar, Waterways, Crash, Long, and Victory. The "Victory" with which the last chapter closes is that won by the *Times-Picayune* and its afternoon crusader, the New Orleans *States*, over the Long machine in 1939-1940.

Mr. Dabney deals mostly in facts, with little interpretation. Since he took these "facts" from day-by-day newspaper accounts, there inevitably are some errors. An example is his reference to the South's being divided into "ten military districts," rather than five, by the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867. When he attempts interpretation he also treads occasionally on disputed ground. For instance, not everyone will agree that the revived Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's "probably would have died shortly" but for the newspaper crusades against it.

This reviewer would be willing to exchange a little of the general history in the book for more specific information about the inner workings of the *Picayune* and the personalities of the men who operated it. He would appreciate, too, more footnotes of documentation in place of those which merely amplify textual terms that to a journalist, at least, are obvious. But these are matters on which the general reader probably would cast his vote for Mr. Dabney's choice of content and technique.

Through the variegated tapestry of the narrative the thread of the *Picayune's* own story can be discerned, though at times only faintly. One significant fact which stands out is that the paper's founders, Francis Lumsden and George Wilkins Kendall of Mexican War fame, had ideas very similar to those of the founders of the penny papers in the North in this same decade: lively writing, local news, enterprise, and low price. As the *Daily Picayune*, the paper was the first in New Orleans to sell for less than a dime. It retailed for six and a quarter cents, the "picayune" from whence came its original name. The present title was assumed in 1914, when the *Daily Picayune* merged with the *Times-Democrat* (founded in 1863 and 1875). The *Daily States* (founded in 1880) was taken over as an afternoon edition in 1933.

Equally fascinating with the story of George Wilkins Kendall, who was recently the subject of a full-length biography, are the chapters dealing with the less widely known Pearl Rivers (Eliza Jane Poitevent), the poet who became the first woman publisher of an important daily in the United States. When she was twenty-seven she inherited the paper with a debt of \$80,000 from her first husband, Alva Morris Holbrook. She not only put the *Daily Picayune* on its financial feet, but was responsible for an editorial blood transfusion which introduced such vitalizing elements as the first writings of Dorothy Dix (Mrs. Elizabeth M. Gilmer).

All in all, Mr. Dabney has handled his masses of material with both historical discrimination and journalistic skill. With similar studies of newspaper files in other regions, *One Hundred Great Years* will provide new flesh and blood for the social histories of the future.

Emory University

RAYMOND B. NIXON

Pills, Petticoats, and Plows: The Southern Country Store. By Thomas D. Clark. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1944. Pp. 359. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.50.)

A sabbatical leave from the University of Kentucky and a grant-in-aid from the Southern Regional Committee of the Social Science Research Council enabled Professor Clark to travel extensively in the South to collect material for the present study. Newspapers, mercantile records, and interviews with surviving storekeepers from an earlier day have constituted the chief sources

of information. As a by-product of his travels Professor Clark has assembled a representative collection of mercantile records at the University of Kentucky.

The book is a study of the country store in the South from 1865 to 1915. This fifty year period witnessed the highest development of the rural general store as a basic institution in southern economy. Before the Civil War it had to compete with the factorage system; after 1915 good roads and ease of travel brought it into competition with stores in larger towns. The author has written his account from a broad perspective. While the store always remains the central theme for purposes of unity, the book is also a social and economic history of the southern farmer. Professor Clark is interested quite as much in what customers discussed on the front porch or around the stove within the store as he is in the business operations of the institution. His results fully justify this approach. The country store supplied every demand for merchandise, thus reflecting the tastes and standards of living of its customers. The storekeeper was interested in the same problems as his patrons since his own welfare was so closely related to the general economic well-being of the community. By keeping this constantly in mind the writer has produced a book which integrates various aspects of southern life very successfully, and which should appeal to a wide circle of readers.

An introductory chapter sketches, somewhat inadequately, the factors behind the rapid development of country stores in the period immediately following the Civil War. A concluding chapter discusses methods of bookkeeping and summarizes the financial relationships of storekeepers with their customers. Here a general appraisal of the merchant's own financial gains and of his economic services to the South is briefly stated.

The remainder of the book is organized largely on the basis of the major types of merchandise and services offered customers. These chapters are far more, however, than a mere listing of goods. In each the writer presents a very effective and very interesting interpretation of the material in terms of southern ways of living. Dietary conditions, for example, are clearly revealed in the summation (p. 160) based on representative accounts in mercantile records: "All afternoon and night cotton wagons rattled away from the stores with their pitiful loads of rations. Hunched over a spring seat a cotton farmer jolted homeward behind a jaded pair of mules with a can of kerosene, a hunk of meat, a pail of compound lard, and dust-covered bags of flour and meal. . . . Three times a day and fifty-two weeks a year, for many, was a long monotonous year of meat, corn bread, biscuit, gravy and molasses. . . . Life for most of the customers was of a marked degree of whiteness. There was white meat, white gravy, white bread, and white shortening for the table, white supremacy at the polls and white gloves for the pall bearers at the grave side." Patent medicines, Christmas goods, clothing, machinery, books, finery, carriages, funeral goods, notions—all the varied stock of the country store—come into the narrative,

and all are fitted into the broad pattern of southern life as a whole. In writing of these Professor Clark sees both the humorous and the pathetic elements involved, and these are treated with a sympathy and understanding which add to the effectiveness of the study.

Descriptions of the economic functions of the store are scattered through the various chapters. It supplied merchandise, served as an instrument of credit, marketed the farmer's cotton, bought his produce, and supplied the machinery with which he raised his crops. Crop liens and mortgages were characteristic of the system. Illustrations of these and of the lien notes for supplies of commercial fertilizer are included. By drawing together the various references made to such matters the reader will have a fairly complete and definite picture of the credit system on which the South operated and to which there was so much objection.

The alliterative title of the book and colorful chapter headings, such as "The Walls Grow Long Paper Tails" and "Ten Gross June Bugs, Assorted," may deceive some as to the real amount of serious research which has gone into this study. The complete absence of footnotes (there is a good bibliography) will displease others. A few may suspect the book because it is so well written and intensely interesting.

A few statements are subject to question. If, on page 215, Professor Clark means pre-Civil War stores by the term "ante-bellum" it is not correct that ready-made clothes for men were "practically unknown" in interior stores. The statement (p. 29) "Never did the ante-bellum country stores become a functional part of southern agriculture and industry" is highly doubtful in the light of southern testimony. J. W. Dorr of the New Orleans *Crescent* in a letter to his paper dated April 27, 1860, commented: "Wherever the middling classes are a considerable proportion of the population, there the country stores are numerous; where the wealthy planters predominate, they are scarce, for everything that the planter does not raise on his estate he purchases in the city." Such country stores would have been unable to continue unless they were a functional part of local economy. If one keeps in mind the essentially middle class nature of southern society throughout its history and analyzes the marketing system of the non-planter class before the Civil War, it is evident that the Civil War period profoundly modified the scheme of mercantile operation rather than instituted a wholly new one. Even some of the basic changes often attributed to the war were already under way before the conflict opened.

Some will look for greater change and development in the country store in the fifty year period treated. It is pictured primarily as a static institution. Others will wish that Professor Clark had given an analysis of the economic functions of the store in one place in the book rather than scattering this throughout. The length and extent of wholesale credit and the whole process of cotton buying and marketing by the store are touched only slightly. Indeed, the one serious objec-

tion that may be raised to the study is the fact that the economic analysis was not carried further. Professor Clark has the material to do this and it is to be hoped that he will carry out his plans to publish some articles of this type. In the meantime, readers will find his book an important and highly interesting contribution in a field which has only recently attracted the attention which it deserves. *Pills, Pettitcoats, and Plows* demonstrates that research can be productive and entertaining at one and the same time.

University of Missouri

LEWIS E. ATHERTON

Walter Clark, Fighting Judge. By Aubrey Lee Brooks. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944. Pp. x, 278. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

Probably no figure in North Carolina history for many a decade has aroused so much controversy and bitterness as did Judge Walter Clark. To his friends and supporters he was a great liberal, a crusader for the right, a prophet of a new era, while to his opponents and enemies he was a revolutionary, an agitator, a demagogue. But whether or not the citizens of the Old North State favored Judge Clark and his practices, there was one thing they could not do—they could not ignore him.

Born in 1846 in Halifax County on the Roanoke River, where the Negro population outnumbered the white by more than two to one, Walter Clark came from the finest stock on both sides. His father, David Clark, one of the wealthiest planters of the state, owned several thousand acres of land and a large number of slaves, and the boy's earliest years were spent amidst the life of the Old South at its best. Having attended a number of schools, young Walter in 1860 entered Tew's Military Academy at Hillsboro, but his first year there had not been completed when the Civil War began, and before his fifteenth birthday he had entered the Confederate army, in which he was rapidly promoted. Taking out nearly a year and half, he graduated at the state university, and then re-enlisted in the army and served to the end.

After the war Clark studied law and by the time he was twenty-one was a practicing attorney, first in Halifax County and later in Raleigh. In 1885 he was appointed and in 1886 elected a superior court judge, and in 1889 was appointed a justice of the state supreme court (elected in 1890). In 1902 he was elected chief justice, a position which he continued to hold until his death in 1924.

Few men have labored more tirelessly than did Judge Clark, and, denying himself most social contacts, he turned out a prodigious amount of work. Among the products of his efforts were his *Annotated Code of Civil Procedure*, his *Supreme Court Reports* (164 volumes), his translation of Constant's *Memoirs of Napoleon*, sixteen volumes of the *State Records of North Carolina* (one of the best of all series of the kind, which he edited), and the five volumes of

Histories of the Several Regiments and Battalions from North Carolina in the Great War 1861-'65 (which he also edited). He delivered many addresses and wrote numerous newspaper and magazine articles.

Clark is chiefly remembered as a liberal, even a radical for his day. Precedents meant little to him, he believed that Blackstone and Coke were bad influences, and it was said that "Judge Clark's dissenting opinion of today becomes the law of tomorrow." He attacked the trusts, favored adequate taxation for the support of schools, worked for the taxation of all railroad property in spite of former exemptions, and in general opposed special privileges and favored the masses.

The controversy aroused by Judge Clark's iconoclasm and spectacular methods has lasted to the present day, and Mr. Brooks' biography of him may be viewed in the light of this controversy. The portrayal of Clark as a knight in shining armor is perhaps deserving of some criticism. That the judge often seemed to delight in controversy merely for its own sake, that he considered it a personal affront when someone differed in opinion with him, that in his hostility to big business he sometimes attacked unjustly—such weaknesses do not receive sufficient emphasis in the volume. The account would have been given broader and deeper meaning had more attention been paid to the state background of rapid and many-sided progress and to the national background of populism, progressivism, trust busting, the rise of organized labor, and other similar topics, with an assessment of Clark's contribution to the history of the state and nation. There are no footnotes, and while an appendix contains a selected list of Judge Clark's writings, nowhere is there a bibliography or any adequate statement as to the materials used by the author (though on page 65, in the body of the text, is a casual reference to certain Clark materials in the State Department of Archives and History and elsewhere).

Mr. Brooks has produced a readable volume, but the definitive biography of Judge Clark is yet to be written.

North Carolina Department
of Archives and History

CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN

Historical News and Notices

THE ANNUAL MEETING

After a lapse of two years, the Southern Historical Association will hold its eighth annual meeting at Nashville, Tennessee, on Friday and Saturday, November 3 and 4, with headquarters at the Hermitage Hotel. In keeping with the times, an abbreviated program is being planned by the Program Committee, of which Professor Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina is chairman. The Friday morning session, devoted to "The Confederacy," includes a paper by James W. Silver of the University of Mississippi on "Propaganda in the Confederacy," and one by Kathryn Trimmer Abbey of Rollins College on "Incidents of the Confederate Blockade." Henry T. Shanks of Birmingham-Southern College will lead the discussion on these papers.

The Tennessee Historical Society will be in charge of the program at the subscription luncheon on Friday. Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University will preside, and Stanley F. Horn of Nashville, editor of the *Southern Lumberman* and president of the Tennessee Historical Society, will present a paper entitled, "The Strategic Importance of Nashville during the Civil War."

At the Friday afternoon session, the theme will be "The Rural South." Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University will preside. The papers will be: "The Furnishing and Supply System in Southern Agriculture since 1864," by Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, and "Southern Plantation Architecture," by James C. Bonner of Georgia State College for Women. The discussion will be led by Robert S. Cotterill of Florida State College for Women.

Wendell H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University will deliver his presidential address at the annual dinner on Friday evening, with William O. Lynch of Indiana University presiding. The session on Saturday morning, dealing with "Aspects of Southern Life," will consist of a paper on "Alexander H. Stephens and the Election of 1860," by Ollinger Crenshaw of Washington and Lee University, and one on "Orthodoxy *versus* Tolerance in the Old South," by Clement Eaton of Lafayette College. J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton of the University of North Carolina will preside over this session.

The annual business meeting will be held at a luncheon session on Saturday. Tentative plans have been made to hold a meeting of the Executive Council on Thursday evening, November 2, preceding the beginning of the formal program; and other meetings of the Council will be held as time permits, as will a meeting of the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Southern History*.

Members of the Association who expect to attend the meeting are reminded that because of wartime conditions of travel *it is essential that round-trip Pullman reservations be made thirty days in advance, and that hotel reservations be made as early as possible, and in any event at least fifteen days in advance of the meeting.* Accommodations can be reserved at the Hermitage Hotel or at the Andrew Jackson Hotel (one block from the Hermitage).

PERSONAL

The seventh series of the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History at Louisiana State University was delivered May 8 and 10 by Arthur C. Cole of Brooklyn College, on the general theme of "The Yankee in the Antebellum South." The titles of the individual lectures were: "Southward Ho!"; "Emissaries of Yankee Culture"; "Exponents of Yankee Enterprise"; and "The Ex-Yankee in the Sectional Controversy."

The Faculty Research Lectures, given annually under the auspices of the graduate school of the University of Texas, were delivered this year by Walter P. Webb of the department of history. Professor Webb devoted three lectures to the subject "The Frontier as a Factor in Western Civilization, 1500-1944," his specific topics being: "The Meaning of a World Frontier"; "The Frontier and Institutions"; and "The Close of the World Frontier and Its Significance."

Fletcher M. Green, of the University of North Carolina, has been granted a year's leave of absence to serve as visiting professor of history at Harvard University.

New members of the history teaching staff at the University of North Carolina during the March to July term were George P. Hammond, dean of the graduate school and head of the history department of the University of New Mexico, and Guion Griffis Johnson, Ruth Daniel, and Bennett H. Wall of Chapel Hill.

Summer school appointments not previously noted include: Thomas D. Clark, of the University of Kentucky, at the University of North Carolina; Walter B. Posey, of Agnes Scott College, at Vanderbilt University; and Paul Murray, of Georgia Southwestern College, at Wesleyan College, Macon, Georgia.

Sidney Walter Martin has been promoted to associate professor of history and acting head of the department at the University of Georgia.

William B. Hatcher, a member of the department of history at Louisiana State University since 1936, has recently been elected president of that institution. He assumed his new duties in June.

James S. Ferguson, formerly instructor in history at the University of North Carolina, has been appointed assistant professor of history at Millsaps College.

Alfred J. Hanna, of Rollins College, and Mrs. Hanna (Kathryn Trimmer Abbey) are spending the summer in Mexico, where he is doing research work in the Mexican Archives for a study of Confederate relations with Mexico and she is working on a study of Confederate blockade running.

James C. Bonner, formerly of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, has been appointed professor of history and head of the department at Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville.

Allen W. Moger of Washington and Lee University has been serving since February in a civilian capacity as chief of the tests and measurements section of the Army School for Special and Morale Services which uses facilities on the Washington and Lee campus.

The Archivist of the United States has announced the appointment to the staff of the Division of War Department Archives of the National Archives of Herbert R. Rifkind, formerly of the Quartermaster General's Office, War Department. Matilda F. Hanson, a member of the staff since 1936, has been made librarian in place of Karl L. Trever, who is assisting the director of research and records description in the administration of the records description program of the National Archives. Members of the staff who have recently entered the armed services include Henry P. Beers and Vernon G. Tate.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Texas State Historical Association held its forty-eighth annual meeting at Austin on April 28 and 29. Among the papers presented were: "Major George W. Littlefield," by Maurice Dowell; "Elliott Roosevelt's Visit to Texas in 1876," by M. L. Crimmins; "The First Capitol of Texas," by Louis W. Kemp; "Old Tascosa, Cowboy Capital of the Panhandle," by John McCarty; "Recollections of a Texas Ranger," by W. H. Roberts; "*The Texas Almanac* in Texas History, 1857-1873," by Stuart McGregor; "Captain Charles Schreiner," by Eugene Hollon; "George W. Miller—Founder of the 101 Ranch," by Chris Emmett; and "David G. Burnet," by Dorothy Louise Fields.

The thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held at St. Louis on April 20, 21, and 22, with a record attendance. The program included a session on "History of the South, 1800-1865," and a lively panel discussion of the report of the Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges. The following papers dealt directly with topics in southern history: "The Pattern of Culture on the Old Southwestern Frontier," by William B. Hamilton of Duke University; "The Early Baptist Church in the

Lower Southwest," by Walter B. Posey of Agnes Scott College; "A Possible Source of Calhoun's Plan of Nullification," by Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University; "Some Northern Wartime Attitudes toward the Post-Civil War South," by George Winston Smith of American University; "The Mississippi Plan of 1875," by David H. Donald of the University of Illinois; and "The Farmers' Alliance in Missouri," by Homer Clevenger of Lindenwood College. William C. Binkley of Vanderbilt University was elected president of the Association for the ensuing year, and Mrs. Clarence S. Paine of Lincoln, Nebraska, was continued in the office of secretary-treasurer. The new members of the Executive Committee are Fred H. Harrington of the University of Arkansas, Merrill M. Jensen of the University of Washington, and Earle D. Ross of Iowa State College.

At the annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society, held at St. Augustine on April 27, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: Philip S. May, Jacksonville, president; John B. Stetson, Jr., DeLand, and Karl Bickel, Sarasota, vice-presidents; Albert C. Manucy, St. Augustine, recording secretary and treasurer; Watt Marchman (in military service), corresponding secretary and librarian; and Mrs. Alberta Johnson, St. Augustine, acting secretary and librarian.

The chief business transacted was the appointment of a committee headed by Karl Bickel to plan for the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Florida to statehood.

The Filson Club observed the sixtieth anniversary of its founding with an address by Preston Davie (son of one of the founders) at the Club's building in Louisville on May 1.

The following papers have been presented at recent monthly meetings of the Louisiana Historical Society: "Creole Civilization in Donaldsonville, 1850," by Lionel C. Durel (April); "Opera in New Orleans: an Historical Symposium" (May); and "Captain T. P. Leathers and the Great Days of the Mississippi Steamboat," by Dewey A. Somdal (June).

The Tallahassee Historical Society has recently published the first volume of a proposed biennial series under the title *Apalachee*. This volume, which supersedes the Society's mimeographed Annual, contains eight papers presented at the monthly meetings of the past two years, most of them dealing with subjects of statewide rather than strictly local interest. The publication committee in charge of this issue was: Guyte P. McCord, Sr., Venila L. Shores, Dorothy Dodd, Rosalind Parker, and Mary Croom Whitfield.

The National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee, recently created by a joint resolution of Congress, has been organized with Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard as chairman and Everett E. Edwards of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as secretary. On April 13 it sponsored a pilgrimage to

Monticello where Herbert A. Kellar of the McCormick Historical Association delivered an address on "Living Agricultural Museums."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be noted: five boxes of papers of Charles McLean Andrews, mainly transcripts, and a diary of 1800; photographic copy of journal of James Cook, first voyage, 1768 to 1771 (National, Canberra, Australia); reproductions of Thomas Jefferson materials in other institutions and in private hands; copy of letter-book of the Navy Board for the Eastern Department, October 24, 1778, to October 29, 1779 (New York Public Library); thirteen papers of, or relating to, Sir Charles Stuart, 1799 to 1815 and 1843; 260 papers of the Rodgers family (John Rodgers and others), 1802 to 1888; one volume of letters and copies of forty-one letters, mainly from Benjamin Henry Latrobe to John Lenthall, including a few letters by Thomas Jefferson, March 5, 1803, to May 17, 1808; two large boxes of papers of the Shippen family (restricted); microfilm of fifty-two pages of correspondence relating to the Russian offer of mediation, 1812-1814 (Stanford University); nine volumes of the journal of Harriet Low (the Far East, England, and elsewhere), 1829 to 1834; six boxes of papers of Henry Ward Beecher, 1836 to 1887 (restricted); seven boxes of additional papers of, and relating to, Constance Cary Harrison, 1838, and 1861 to 1943; three boxes of papers of Montgomery Cunningham Meigs, 1850 to 1889, his journal of the Battle of Chattanooga, November 23 to 25, 1863, and a volume entitled "Notes of travel in Europe, 1875" (letters from him to his wife and daughter); photostat of diary of George O. Hand, Union soldier, August 19, 1861, to May 19, 1864; one box of additional papers and diary of Joseph Bloomfield Osborn, 1861 to 1865; one volume of diary of Josephine Forney Roedel, covering journey from Virginia to Pennsylvania and return, October 28, 1863, to July 13, 1864; thirty-one letters from John Fiske to Abby Morgan Fiske (his wife), August 24, 1873, to April 8, 1896; two volumes and two loose pieces, including minutes and financial record of the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party, Philadelphia Branch, November 15, 1873, to October 15, 1890; twenty-four papers of Jay Gould (mainly letters from him to William Ward), November 29, 1873, to August 26, 1876; twenty-three boxes of papers of Albert Sidney Burleson, 1894 to 1937 (restricted); fourteen boxes of additional papers of Elizabeth Madox Roberts, 1922 to 1941; one large box of Edwin Markham papers and other materials; seven shelves of papers and other materials of, and relating to, May Robson, actress.

The Ninth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States for the fiscal year 1942-1943, issued in May, discusses the gigantic problem posed by the

records of the Federal government—an estimated 16,000,000 cubic feet of them divided about equally between Washington and the field—and the efforts of the National Archives to deal with this problem. Particular emphasis was given during 1942-1943 to encouraging better management of current records throughout the government, to obtaining legislation that will facilitate the disposal of records no longer of value, and to the continued accessioning of valuable non-current records, as the result of which the National Archives on June 30, 1943, had more than 500,000 cubic feet of records of all types, including maps, motion-picture films, microfilms, and still photographs, in its custody. To conserve paper and funds, the annual report was not printed this year and copies will not be available for general distribution until it is published after the war.

To the ever-growing group of War Department field records in the National Archives have been added records of the arsenals at Springfield, Massachusetts, 1794-1911, Watertown, Massachusetts, 1902-1917, and Frankford, Pennsylvania, 1911-1930; records of the Fort Omaha Quartermaster, 1866-1900; records of Fort Stevens, Oregon, and Fort Canby (formerly Fort Cape Disappointment), Washington, 1867-1928; correspondence of the Judge Advocate and Quartermaster, Department of Dakota, 1874-1904, and Department of Texas, 1879-1916; and records of the Department of Missouri, 1875-1910, of the Headquarters, Department of the Lakes, 1898-1910, and of the Central Department, 1916-1920. Other material recently acquired includes a record set of published charts of coastal waters throughout the world, exclusive of the United States and its possessions, issued by the Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, 1869-1934; about 60,000 photographic negatives with corresponding prints made at the Philadelphia Naval Aircraft Factory of buildings, equipment, and aircraft in construction, 1918-1941; records of the headquarters of the Research Information Committee, 1917-1921, relating to the exchange of scientific, technical, and industrial research information among the Allied Governments; and records of shipping commissioners in fourteen major ports, 1873-1932, consisting of shipping articles and official logbooks of vessels.

President Roosevelt has recently presented to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, New York, additional sections of his White House files for the period March, 1933, to June, 1943. Two sections are made up of correspondence on national issues arising out of the war effort, such as the rights of Negro citizens with respect to the draft, government civil service, defense production, and the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill. Two other groups of correspondence contain much of interest for future students of the country's political history during the Roosevelt administrations. One consists of applications, endorsements, acceptances, and protests regarding the appointment of federal officials in the States, 1933-1937. The other, covering the same period, is comprised of letters written to the President and other national leaders of the Demo-

cratic party by local and state committee members, congressmen, and senators, reporting on political prospects in their districts and making recommendations as to the campaign strategy to be followed; although some of these letters relate to the campaigns preceding the congressional elections of 1934, 1936, and 1938, most of the correspondence centers on the 1936 presidential campaign. Among other materials received from the White House are papers relating to the operations of the National Resources Planning Board, 1934-1941; invitations and Christmas greetings, letters accompanying gifts, and correspondence relating to the birthday balls, 1941-1942; and copies of the official stenographic reports of the President's addresses for 1943 and of his press conferences for July-December, 1943. He has recently given to the Library the journal of the U. S. S. *Hornet*, Alexander Claxton, Commander, March 30-September 22, 1827, and the journal of the U. S. S. *St. Louis*, John D. Sloat, Commander, March 4, 1829-December 9, 1831, as well as a notable collection of prints and lithographs of naval scenes of the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Civil War.

Recent accessions to the manuscripts division of the North Carolina State Department of Archives and History include: reminiscences of Dr. Paul B. Barringer on early Lincoln County; a book of autographs of the members of the North Carolina state convention of 1861; a typescript volume on the Finney family; a microcopy of a volume listing North Carolina land grants in Tennessee (original in the National Archives); and a collection of maps of North Carolina and adjoining areas, ranging in date from 1823 to 1860.

The University of Georgia Library has recently acquired a complete file of the *Atlanta Journal*, 1873-1944.

The Maryland Historical Society has received as gifts a large collection of account books, documents, and letters dealing with the settlement of the estate of Robert Oliver; the administration record book for the estate of Frederick Hammer, 1818-1827; a volume of letters from Nicholas Biddle, Edward C. Pinckney, John Randolph of Roanoke, and others; a group of papers concerning the establishment of Towson as the Baltimore County seat; and copies of important Baltimore wills.

Among the items listed in the catalogue of the acquisitions of the Manuscript Division of the New York Public Library for 1943, the following will be of interest to students of southern history: letters to Ellis Gray Loring from Lydia Maria Child, 1838-1843, discussing antislavery movement, contemporary politics, and problems of editing the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*; diary of Henry Clay Scott, recording his duties and experiences while serving as a soldier in Virginia with a New York regiment from May, 1861, to May, 1863; account books of Edward T. Tayloe, 1819-1833, and 1850-1858, recording his expenses while a student at Harvard and as a secretary to the United States ministers to

Mexico and Colombia, and accounts of the management of the family plantation in Virginia; copy book of Lieutenant Josiah Gorgas, of the siege train sent to Mexico, containing orders received and issued en route and during the Mexican campaign, 1846-1848; correspondence, personal and financial, of F. P. Corbin of Virginia and Paris, France, including papers dating back to 1716 regarding the estate of James Hamilton (Mrs. Corbin's father); and numerous letters of well-known figures in American history, including Jefferson Davis, Marquis de Lafayette, and Robert E. Lee.

Announcement has been made by E. P. Dutton and Company that the contest for the Fourth Thomas Jefferson Southern Award of \$2500 for the best book manuscript submitted by a southern author closes on February 1, 1945. The competition is open to authors born in the South, regardless of present residence, and to those living in the South who have resided there for at least five years, regardless of place of birth. Manuscripts should not be less than 50,000 words in length, and need not be southern in setting. Both fiction and non-fiction are eligible, but not poetry, drama, short stories, or material for textbooks.

In a mimeographed circular issued by the National Archives in April, Vernon G. Setser, formerly on the staff of the National Archives and now senior historian in the office of the Quartermaster General, War Department, discusses the question, "Can the War History Projects Contribute to the Solution of Federal Records Problems?" Pointing out the complexities in the problem of handling the mass of records now being accumulated by government agencies, he offers suggestions as to how these problems may be met to insure the effective use of such records in a program of research which will continue in peacetime.

Buildings and Equipment for Archives, published in June as Bulletin No. 6 of The National Archives, consists of three papers which were read at the seventh annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists. In "Some Observations on Planning Archives Buildings," Louis A. Simon, retired supervising architect of the Public Buildings Administration and now consulting architect, offers a number of important suggestions based on his own experience in connection with the planning and use of the present National Archives Building. "Collaboration between Archivists and Architects in Planning Archives Buildings," by Victor Gondos, Jr., a member of the staff of the Division of War Department Archives of the National Archives, emphasizes especially the importance of close co-operation in advance between the builder and the prospective user of an archives building. In "Equipment Needs to be Considered in Constructing Post-War Archival Depositories," William J. Van Schreeven, head archivist in the Virginia State Library at Richmond, discusses the comparative merits of various types of filing cases, workroom arrangements, and microfilm equipment, and concludes with the statement that "the proper preliminary planning of a building takes a long time and only by having the requirements

worked out to the last book truck and card cabinet can a building and equipment suited to the care and servicing of archival material be obtained."

The fourth number of the Emory University *Sources and Reprints* is "A Diary-Letter Written from the Methodist General Conference of 1844 by the Rev. W. J. Parks," edited by Franklin Nutting Parker, dean emeritus of the Candler School of Theology. The letter gives a view of the discussion of slavery and the case of Bishop John O. Andrew as seen by a southern participant in the Conference, and the editor's introduction presents a succinct account of the development of the issue which resulted in the separation of the Methodist Church into the northern and the southern branch in 1844.

The Bowmans: A Pioneering Family in Virginia, Kentucky, and the Northwest Territory (Staunton, Va.: McClure Company, 1943, pp. 185, illustrations and maps, \$5.00), by John W. Wayland, is primarily the story of four brothers—John, Abraham, Joseph, and Isaac Bowman—who played important roles in civil and military affairs in Virginia and the West in the colonial and Revolutionary period. The narrative is based mainly upon official records, manuscripts preserved in the Bowman family and in the Draper Collection, and a wide range of published sources.

A Pilgrimage of Liberty: A Contemporary Account of the Triumphal Tour of General Lafayette through the Southern and Western States in 1825, as Reported by the Local Newspapers (Athens, Ohio: The Lawhead Press, 1944, pp. 438, bibliography, map, \$3.00), compiled and edited by Edgar Ewing Brandon, consists largely of extracts from about eighty contemporary newspapers describing local celebrations in honor of Lafayette as he visited the towns and communities along the route of his trip through the South and the West in 1825. Although there is little indication of critical selection or treatment, the compilation with its explanatory annotations should prove helpful to students of American cultural conditions of the period as well as to prospective biographers of Lafayette.

Fiddles in the Cumberlands (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1943, pp. ix, 306, appendix, \$3.00), edited by Lela McDowell Blankenship, is a somewhat unsatisfactory combination of fact and fiction relating to the Civil War in the Cumberland Plateau region of Tennessee. While the greater part of the volume consists of journal entries made by Amanda McDowell during the War, no effort has been made to correlate those entries with the military history of the region, and much of the potential value of the journal is minimized by the editor's propensity for inserting passages of conversation to fill the gaps.

Concerning Mr. Lincoln: In Which Abraham Lincoln Is Pictured as He Appeared to Letter Writers of His Time (Springfield, Ill.: The Abraham Lincoln Association, 1944, pp. ix, 141, \$3.00), compiled by Harry E. Pratt, brings

together sixty-two items "carefully selected from a large number of manuscripts located in libraries and private collections," for the purpose of obtaining light on Lincoln through the eyes of a wide variety of ordinary people who witnessed important events or were associated with him in his more or less unguarded moments. The letters have been arranged chronologically and grouped under thirteen subject headings, and each letter is accompanied by an introduction giving the historical setting, and by footnotes identifying the more important persons and events. The chief contribution of the collection is its confirmation of published historical data rather than the presentation of new information.

Forman's Our Republic; A Brief History of the American People (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1944, pp. xvi, 952, lv, illustrations, maps, bibliography, appendix, \$4.00), is a revised and enlarged edition of a well-known textbook for college use. The revision, done by Fremont P. Wirth of George Peabody College for Teachers, not only brings the narrative down to the present but also changes the emphasis or interpretation of parts of the older work and enlarges the bibliographical material to include important references which have appeared since the publication of the original edition.

Addresses, Letters, and Papers of Clyde Roark Hoey, Governor of North Carolina, 1937-1941 (Raleigh: North Carolina Council of State, 1944, pp. xxxii, 869, illustrations, appendix), edited by David L. Corbitt, is the latest volume in the program of the state of North Carolina to make the official record of its governors available as soon as possible after their term of service. In addition to the type of material included in the volumes on earlier administrations, this one introduces newspaper comments about contemporaneous events as a means of providing the setting of addresses or correspondence. These comments, together with the somewhat laudatory biographical sketch of Governor Hoey, written by Robert L. Thompson, should assist future users of these documents to see what some of his contemporaries thought of him, but they will also confront those users with a problem in historical objectivity.

As the fourth of its series of facsimile reproductions of rare pamphlets, the Tracy W. McGregor Library of the University of Virginia has published *A Brief Description of the Province of Carolina on the Coasts of Floreda* (Charlottesville, 1944, pp. 23), with an introduction and bibliographical note by John Tate Lanning. The continuation of the title of this pamphlet, which was first published in London in 1666 for promotional purposes, reads as follows: ". . . and More perticularly of a New-Plantation begun by the English at Cape-Feare, on that River now by them called Charles-River, the 29th of May. 1664. Wherein is set forth The Healthfulness of the Air; the Fertility of the Earth, and Waters; and the great Pleasure and Profit will accrue to those that shall go thither to enjoy the same. Also, Directions and advice to such as shall go thither

whether on their own accmpts, or to serve under another. Together with A most accurate Map of the whole Province."

Professor Lanning's introduction gives an insight into the historical setting of the colonization project; and his bibliographical note, in discussing the pamphlet itself, shows that "there is no edition of this rare pamphlet which has not been tampered with in some way" (p. 4). This reproduction of the tract should satisfy both the antiquarian and the specialist.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Politics in Maryland During the Civil War," continued, by Charles Branch Clark, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).

"Madame Grelaud's French School," by Lucy Leigh Bowie, *ibid.*

"Vignettes of Maryland History," by Raphael Semmes, *ibid.*

"The Foreign Trade of Virginia, 1789-1809," by Winifred J. Losse, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).

"The Fish and Fisheries of Colonial Virginia," concluded, by John C. Pearson, *ibid.*

"Modern Education and William Byrd of Westover," by Dorothy Tyler, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).

"The Greatest Fact in Modern History," by Matthew Page Andrews, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).

"Footnotes upon Some XVII Century Virginians," by Francis Burton Harrison, *ibid.*

"A Bright Thread of Virginia History: Some Notes on the Corotoman River," by Alf J. Mapp, Jr., *ibid.*

"The Aboriginal Population of Tidewater Virginia," by Maurice A. Mook, in the *American Anthropologist* (April-June).

"Anthony Morgan of Old Rappahannock Co.," by M. W. Hiden, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).

"Madam Nelson—nee Taliaferro," by William Buckner McGroarty, *ibid.*

"Disloyalty to the Confederacy in Southwestern Virginia, 1861-1865," by Henry T. Shanks, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).

"History of Albemarle Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy," by Isabelle H. Goss, in the *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society* (1943-1944).

"Reminiscences of Charlottesville in the 1880's," by James P. C. Southall, *ibid.*

"Peter Carr of Carr's-Brook (1770-1815)," by Elizabeth Dabney Coleman, *ibid.*

"Romney in the Civil War," by Charles H. Ambler, in *West Virginia History* (April).

"Additional Notes on the Herriott Farm Site," by Carl P. Manson and Captain H. A. MacCord, *ibid.*

- "William Gaston and the Supreme Court of North Carolina," by Joseph Herman Schauinger, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "Old Straight: A Sketch of the Life and Campaigns of Lieutenant General Alexander P. Stewart, C. S. A.," by Marshall Wingfield, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Religious Activities in Civil War Memphis," by Fred T. Wooten, Jr., *ibid.*
- "John Armfield of Beersheba Springs," continued, by Isabel Howell, *ibid.*
- "Ann Robertson: An Unsung Tennessee Heroine," by Samuel C. Williams, *ibid.*
- "The Development of Unionism in East Tennessee," by J. Reuben Sheeler, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "Gideon Shryock, Kentucky Architect, and Greek Revival Architecture in Kentucky," by Alfred J. Andrews, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).
- "John Finley, Pioneer of Fleming County," by R. S. Cotterill, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "Life, Labor and Society in Boone County, Missouri, 1834-1852, as Revealed in the Correspondence of an Immigrant Slave Owning Family from North Carolina," Part I, by Lewis E. Atherton, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "Historical Notes on Masonic Organizations in Indian Territory," in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Spring).
- "Lawrie Tatum's Indian Policy," by Aubrey L. Steele, *ibid.*
- "Recollections of the Osages in the Seventies," by Ralph H. Records, *ibid.*
- "First Hospitals in Tulsa," by Fred S. Clinton, *ibid.*
- "Yancey Lewis, 1861-1916," by Robert L. Williams, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Letters of Severn Teackle Wallis, 1816-1894," by Frederick Dawn Scott, S. J., in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Letters of John Taylor of Caroline," concluded, contributed by Hans Hammond, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "A Frenchman Visits Albemarle, 1816," edited by J. M. Carriere and L. G. Moffatt, in the *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society* (1943-1944).
- "A Letter Concerning The Virginia Literary, Scientific and Military Academy," annotated by Marshall W. Brett, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (April).
- "North Carolina Bibliography, 1942-1943," by Mary Lindsay Thornton, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).

- "The Capture of a Confederate Blockade Runner; Extracts from the Journal of a Confederate Naval Officer," edited by Frank E. Vandiver, *ibid.*
- "Reconstruction Letters from North Carolina, Part X, Letters to James Abram Garfield," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*
- "Letters from Aaron V. Brown to Alfred O. P. Nicholson, 1844-1850," edited by Joseph H. Parks, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1808," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "Two Letters of 1831 by James H. Atherton," edited by Samuel M. Wilson, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).
- "Student Life at Western Military Institute: William Preston Johnston's Journal, 1847-1848," edited by Arthur Marvin Shaw, *ibid.*
- "Heirs in Court of Appeals Deeds," continued, compiled by Hattie M. Scott, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "Hardin County, Ky., Marriages, 1792-1825," continued, compiled by Hattie M. Scott and Nina Visscher, *ibid.*
- "A Bibliography of Early Western Travel in Kentucky (With Annotations), 1674-1824," by Willard Rouse Jillson, *ibid.*
- "A Supplementary List of Kentucky Imprints, 1794-1820, Additional to those Recorded in American Imprints Inventory Check Lists Nos. 5 and 6," by Douglas C. McMurtrie and Albert H. Allen, *ibid.*

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Changing Composition of the Savannah Business Community, 1900-1940," by W. H. Steiner, in the *Southern Economic Journal* (April).
- "The Wrecking Business on the Florida Reef, 1822-1860," by Dorothy Dodd, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Pioneer Florida: A Free Public School in St. Augustine," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "The Spring Grove Guards," by Samuel E. Cobb, *ibid.*
- "The Location of the Historic Natchez Villages," by Andrew C. Albrecht, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).
- "Sarah Ann Ellis Dorsey, Donor of Beauvoir," by W. A. Evans, *ibid.*
- "The Life of a Southern Plantation Owner During Reconstruction as Revealed in the Clay Sharkey Papers," by George C. Osborn, *ibid.*
- "The Plantation Experience of Joseph and Lavinia Erwin, 1807-1836," by Alice Pemble White, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Butler Regime in Louisiana," by Thomas Ewing Dabney, *ibid.*
- "The Political Career of Pinckney Benton Stewart Pinchback," by Agnes Smith Grosz, *ibid.*
- "Slavery in Arkansas," by Clyde W. Cathey, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Spring).

- "Activities of the Women of Arkansas During the War Between the States," by Clara B. Eno, *ibid.*
- "Early Lawrence County History," by Walter E. McLeod, *ibid.*
- "Clearing the Channel—The Snagboat in Arkansas," by Diana Sherwood, *ibid.*
- "Railroad Enterprise in Texas, 1836-1841," by Andrew Forest Muir, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Minutes of the Vestry of St. Stephen's Parish, South Carolina, 1754-1873," edited by Anne Allston Porcher, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "The Memoirs of Frederick Adolphus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gaillard Stoney, *ibid.*
- "Captain Langdon Cheves, Jr., and the Confederate Silk Dress Balloon," continued, edited by J. H. Easterby, *ibid.*
- "A Provisional Guide to Manuscripts in the South Carolina Historical Society," by Helen C. McCormack, *ibid.*
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
- "W. A. Montgomery's Record of the Raymond Fencibles," edited by P. L. Rainwater, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).
- "Louisiana Officers of the Confederate Navy," by George T. Ness, Jr., in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Check List of Historical Records Survey and Survey of Federal Archives Publications for Louisiana," by John C. L. Andreassen, *ibid.*
- "A Letter of Lieutenant Boone, C.S.A.," edited by Mrs. Nora Boone Carlisle, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Spring).
- "Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," edited by E. W. Winkler, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," continued, edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "On the Preservation of Historical Manuscripts," by Charles McLean Andrews, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "Our Widening Horizon," by Theodore C. Blegen, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "The Authorship of the Disputed Federalist Papers," by Douglass Adair, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).

- "Trailways to the Momentous Transfer [Louisiana Purchase]," by Isaac Joslin Cox, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Pryor-Potter Duel," by William B. Hesseltine, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (June).
- "U. B. Phillips and the Plantation Legend," by Richard Hofstadter, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "The New England Negro as Seen in Advertisements for Runaway Slaves," by Lorenzo J. Greene, *ibid.*
- "Anna Elizabeth Dickinson and the Civil War: for and against Lincoln," by James Harvey Young, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "Campaigning with the First Minnesota, a Civil War Diary," continued, edited by Hazel C. Wolf, in *Minnesota History* (June).
- "Colorado Pioneers in the Civil War," by L. A. McGee, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (June).
- "Captain Hyatt, Being the Letters Written During the Years 1863-1864, to his wife, Mary, by Captain T. S. Hyatt, 126th Ohio Volunteer Infantry," edited by Hudson Hyatt, in the *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* (April-June).
- "A Michigan Soldier's Diary, 1863," edited by Russell Kirk, in *Michigan History* (April-June).
- "The Political Influence of the Civil War Bonded Debt During Johnson's Administration," by William A. Russ, Jr., in the *Susquehanna University Studies* (March).
- "John Sharp Williams and International Peace," by George C. Osborn, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).
- "Economic Interpretation of the Constitution," by Eugene C. Barker, in the *Texas Law Review* (June).

CONTRIBUTORS

GEORGE WINSTON SMITH is associate professor of history at American University, Washington, D. C.

ROBERT S. COTTERILL is professor of history at Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee.

PAUL MURRAY is professor of history and social science at Georgia Southwestern College, Americus.

JOSEPH H. PARKS is associate professor of history at Birmingham-Southern College.

AUSTIN L. VENABLE is assistant professor of history at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

HUBERT A. COLEMAN is assistant professor of history and political science at The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the
United States containing articles, inedited documents,
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JOHN TATE LANNING
ASSOCIATE MANAGING EDITOR: ALAN K. MANCHESTER

BOARD OF EDITORS

ARTHUR S. AITON	IRVING A. LEONARD
CARLOS E. CASTANEDA	ALAN K. MANCHESTER
ROSCOE R. HILL	DANA G. MUNRO
ROLAND DENNIS HUSSEY	CHARLES E. NOWELL
JOHN TATE LANNING	ARTHUR P. WHITAKER

ADVISORY EDITORS

HERBERT E. BOLTON	CLARENCE H. HARING
ISAAC JOSLIN COX	J. FRED RIPPY
WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON	

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham, North Carolina

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The April, 1944, issue contains the following:

The Greatest Fact in Modern History, by Matthew Page Andrews
*A Letter Concerning "The Virginia Literary, Scientific and Military
Academy,"* annotated by Marshall W. Butt

*Bright Threads of Virginia History: Some Notes on the Corotoman
River*, by Alf J. Mapp, Jr.

*Footnotes upon Some XVII Century Virginians: Commentaries upon
the Ancestry of Benjamin Harrison*, by Francis Burton Harrison

Letters of John Taylor of Caroline, edited by Hans Hammond

Notes and Queries Genealogies Book Reviews

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;

Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00

Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y.
CLAYTON TORRENCE

The Pacific Historical Review

Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the
American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Book Review Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

DAN E. CLARK

FRANCIS H. HERRICK

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

MERRILL M. JENSEN

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

W. KAYE LAMB

MAX SAVELLE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

The William and Mary Quarterly

A Magazine of Early American History, Institutions, and Culture

A new series of the William and Mary College Quarterly
with a broadened field of interest

Published by the College of William and Mary

Board of Editors

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY
University of Virginia

RICHARD L. MORTON
College of William and Mary

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS
Clements Library

CURTIS P. NETTELS
University of Wisconsin

JULIAN P. BOYD
Princeton University

STANLEY PARGELLIS
Newberry Library

VIRGINIUS DABNEY
Richmond *Times-Dispatch*

JOHN E. POMFRET
College of William and Mary

HUNTER D. FARISH
Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER
Harvard University

LEONARD W. LABAREE
Yale University

EARL G. SWEM
College of William and Mary

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON
Harvard University

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER
Princeton University

LOUIS B. WRIGHT, Huntington Library

Managing Editor RICHARD L. MORTON, College of William and Mary

Subscription rates: \$4.00 the calendar year. \$1.00 a copy

Correspondence relating to the

William and Mary Quarterly should be addressed to the Managing Editor
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50;
Contributing, \$10.00; Life, a sum in dollars equal to 100 less
age of applicant.

Editor:
EVERETT E. EDWARDS

Secretary-Treasurer:
ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Complete back files of **THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY**

Including title page and index for each volume
may be obtained at \$3.00 per volume

Single numbers can be supplied at 75 cents each

SEND ORDERS TO

JAMES W. PATTON, *Secretary-Treasurer*

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina (1944)

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1945)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

ALFRED J. HANNA, Rollins College (1944)

BERNARD MAYO, University of Virginia (1944)

WILLIAM G. BEAN, Washington and Lee University (1945)

JENNINGS B. SANDERS, Memphis State College (1945)

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

- Beatty, Richmond C., revs. McKeithan's (ed.) *A Collection of Hayne Letters*, 362-64; communication from, 500.
- Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, by Charles W. Ramsdell, revd., 360-62.
- Belknap, Jeremy, and Massachusetts state historical society, 24.
- Bell, John, 448; leader of Tennessee Whigs, 308-309; candidacy for re-election, 311-14; member Senate committee on territories, 315; attitude toward Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 317-21, 327-29.
- Benjamin, Judah P., biog., revd., 111-12.
- Benton, Thomas H., interest in Florida land problems, 185-87.
- Berger, Max, *The British Traveller in America, 1836-1860*, revd., 106-107.
- Bevan, Joseph V., collector of records for Georgia, 12.
- Bibliography of First Printings of the Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*, compiled by Charles F. Heartman and James R. Canny, revd., 223.
- Bieseke, Rudolph L., 79.
- Binkley, William C., 374; revs. Crittenden and Godard's (eds.) *Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook*, 494-98.
- Birney, James G., attitude toward Whigs, 339, 340.
- Blair, Francis P., comment on peace mission of, 354.
- Bland, Theodorick, fate of personal papers of, 17-18.
- Blankenship, Lela M., (ed.), *Fiddles in the Cumberlands*, noted, 379.
- Blennerhassett, Harman, 392.
- Bohner, B. L., testimonial concerning De Bow, 416.
- Boling, William, physician in Alabama, 443.
- Bonaparte, Charles J., biog., revd., 117-19.
- Bonner, James C., 371, 373; revs. Powell's *I Can Go Home Again*, 229-30.
- Booth, William A., comment on early health conditions, 433.
- Bouquet, Henry, British officer in Florida, 62, 64.
- Bowles, William A., in Florida Indian problems, 275, 277, 282, 288.
- Bowmans: A Pioneering Family in Virginia, Kentucky, and the Northwest Territory*, by John W. Wayland, noted, 379.
- Boyd, James, deceased, 233.
- Boyd, Julian P., 124, 125, 240.
- Bozeman, Nathan, physician in Alabama, 443.
- Brandon, Edgar E., (ed.), *A Pilgrimage of Liberty*, noted, 379.
- Brantley, William, influence on De Bow, 407.
- Brief Description of the Province of Carolina on the Coasts of Floreda*, ed. by John Tate Lanning, noted, 380-81.
- British Traveller in America, 1836-1860*, by Max Berger, revd., 106-107.
- Brock, Robert A., 25.
- Brooks, Aubrey L., *Walter Clark, Fighting Judge*, revd., 369-70.
- Brooks, Philip C., 121, 502.
- Brownlow, William G., and Tennessee Whigs, 309, 313.
- Bruce, Blanche K., Negro politician in Mississippi, 40, 46; delegate to national Republican convention, 54.
- Bruce, Kathleen, 232; revs. Wish's *George Fitzhugh: Propagandist of the Old South* 356-59.
- Bruin, Peter Bryan, early settler at Natchez, 391.
- Brune, William, early settler at Natchez, 391.
- Buchanan, George R., in Mississippi politics, 41, 44, 54.
- Buchanan, James, 151, 204.
- Bugg, Robert M., Whig congressman, 327, 329.
- Buildings and Equipment for Archives*, noted, 378.
- Bulloch, James D., Confederate purchasing agent, 154, 157.
- Burgwyn, Henry K., comments on factorage firms, 192.
- Burlington Court Book: A Record of Quaker Jurisprudence in West New Jersey, 1680-1709*, ed. by H. Clay Reed and George J. Miller, noted, 243.
- Burton, John S., in Mississippi politics, 54.
- Burton, Ralph, British officer in Florida, 62.
- Butler, Benjamin F., 453.
- Butler, Robert, land official in territorial Florida, 175-79.
- Byrd, William, purchases manuscripts, 26.
- Cabell, Branch, (coauth.), *The St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities*, revd., 119-20.
- Caldwell, Norman W., 232.
- Calendar of Maryland State Papers; No. 1, The Black Books*, ed. by Elizabeth W. Meade, Emil Fossan, and Roger Thomas, revd., 97-98.
- Calhoun, John C., Yancey's attitude toward, 337.
- Call, Richard K., receiver of Tallahassee land office, 180.
- Campbell, Archibald, British officer in America, 76.
- Campbell, Charles, interest in Bland papers, 17-18.
- Campbell, David, letter to, 476-79.
- Campbell, John, British commander in West Florida, 76.
- Campbell, William B., and Tennessee Whigs, 310, 328.

- Candler, Allen D., preservation of Georgia records, 32.
- Canny, James R., (cocomp.), *A Bibliography of First Printings of the Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*, revd., 223.
- Canterbury, John, early Baptist preacher in Alabama, 163.
- Capers, William, 408.
- Cappon, Lester J., 235, 508.
- Carey, Henry C., interest in southern resources, 258-59.
- Carleton, Guy, British officer in America, 62.
- Carroll, Bartholomew R., 33.
- Carroll, H. Bailey, revs. Copeland's *Kendall of the Picayune*, 107-109.
- Carter, Ham C., in Mississippi politics, 44, 50.
- Cartwright, S. A., physician in Mississippi, 441.
- Case, Lynn M., 78.
- Castañeda, Carlos E., 233.
- Cauthen, Charles E., revs. Milling's *Exile Without an End*, 215-16.
- Chaffin, Nora C., 241, 501.
- Chalmers, James R., role of in Mississippi politics, 37-58.
- Chandler, Green C., Mississippi politician, 41.
- Chandler, William E., relations with Mississippi Republicans, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 54, 55.
- Chaney, Bailey E., Baptist preacher in Louisiana, 163.
- Channing, William Ellery, 465.
- "Chapter of Pantan, Leslie and Company," by Robert S. Cotterill, 275-92.
- Charles DeMorse: Pioneer Editor and Statesman*, by Ernest Wallace, revd., 223-24.
- Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Earlier Career*, by Eric F. Goldman, revd., 117-19.
- Charleston, establishment of Unitarian church at, 466-67.
- Chase, Salmon P., 260; opposes repeal of Missouri Compromise, 315-16, 320.
- Chase, William H., commander of Florida troops, 151-52.
- Chatelain, Verne E., 241.
- Cheever, George B., interest in southern business, 268.
- Cherokee Indians, and Pantan-Leslie debts, 276, 281, 287, 291.
- Chester, Peter, British governor of West Florida, 65.
- Chickasaw Cession, land speculation in, 84-92.
- Chickasaw Indians, correspondence with John Stuart, 66; land speculation profits, 84-92; and Pantan-Leslie debts, 278-89.
- Chissolm, James, British officer in Florida, 70.
- Chitwood, Oliver P., revs. Clarke's *Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies*, 212-13.
- Choctaw Indians, correspondence with John Stuart, 66; and Pantan-Leslie debts, 278-90.
- Chorley, Kenneth, 125.
- Chotard, Jean Marie, early settler at Natchez, 391.
- Christy, John H., comment on squatter sovereignty, 206.
- Civil War, effect on historical records, 29-30, 33; Confederate naval activities in, 153-58; Davis' observations on, 207-211; stimulates northern interest in southern resources, 253-74; correspondence concerning, 343-55.
- Claiborne, John F. H., candidate for congressman, 475, 476.
- Claiborne, William C. C., 278.
- Clark, Blanche H., 501.
- Clark, G. W., association with Yancey, 336.
- Clark, James Freeman, 465.
- Clark, Kenneth M., financing and marketing sugar crop, 193, 195, 197.
- Clark, Thomas D., 121, 231, 371; *Pills, Petticoats, and Plows: The Southern Country Store*, revd., 366-69; revs. Cabell and Hanna's *The St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities*, 119-20.
- Clark, Walter, edits North Carolina records, 30; biog., revd., 369-70.
- Clarke, Mary P., *Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies*, revd., 212-13.
- Clay, Henry, approval of Stephen R. Mallory, 139-40; attitude of abolitionists toward, 338-39.
- Clayton, John M., 322.
- Cleland, J. C., receiver of East Florida land office, 180.
- Cleland, Robert G., 125.
- Clevenger, Homer, 374.
- Cline, Pierce, deceased, 122.
- Clyde, Paul H., 232.
- Cobb, Howell, 93.
- Colbert, George, Chickasaw leader, 280.
- Cole, Arthur C., delivers Fleming lectures, 372.
- Cole, George W., receiver of East Florida land office, 180.
- Coleman, Hubert A., 502; "Notes on the Civil War Correspondence of Private Henry Tucker," 343-55.
- Collection of Hayne Letters*, ed. by Daniel M. McKeithan, revd., 362-64; communications on, 498-500.
- Columbia Historical Society, meetings noted, 123, 234; publication of *Records*, 509.
- Concerning Mr. Lincoln*, compiled by Harry E. Pratt, noted, 379-80.
- Confederacy, naval activities of, 153-58; books on, revd., 225-26, 360-62.
- Connor, William, 397.

- "Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association," 82-83.
- Conway, V. Y., land official in territorial Florida, 178.
- Cooper, George F., comment on health conditions, 434.
- Cooper, Thomas, conservative opposition to, 470, 474.
- Copeland, Fayette, *Kendall of the Picayune*, revd., 107-109.
- Corbitt, David L., (ed.), *Addresses, Letters, and Papers of Clyde Roark Hoey, Governor of North Carolina*, noted, 380.
- Cornell, Alex, and Creek Indian debt, 291-92.
- Cornwallis, Lord, commander of Southern district, 76.
- "Correspondence Relating to the Progressive Party's 'Lily White' Policy in 1912," ed. by Arthur S. Link, 480-90.
- Cotterill, Robert S., 79, 371; "A Chapter of Pantan, Leslie and Company," 275-92.
- Cotton in Peace and War*, by John F. Moloney, noted, 242.
- Coulter, E. Merton, 233.
- Courtney, James, early preacher in Alabama, 163.
- Craven, Avery O., 231; revs. Curti's *The Growth of American Thought*, 359-60.
- Crawford, George W., in Georgia politics, 304.
- Crawford, William H., 473.
- Creek Indians, correspondence with John Stuart, 66; and Pantan-Leslie debts, 277-91.
- Crenshaw, Ollinger, 371.
- Crittenden, Christopher, (coed.), *Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook*, revd., 495-98; revs. Brooks' *Walter Clark, Fighting Judge*, 369-70.
- Cuba, movement for acquisition of, 147-49.
- Cullom, William, and Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 324, 327, 329.
- Curry, Jabez L. M., 25.
- Curti, Merle, *The Growth of American Thought*, revd., 359-60.
- Curtis, Richard, early Baptist leader in Mississippi, 162.
- Cushing, William, on authorship of *The Slaveholder Abroad*, 92.
- Dabney, Thomas E., *One Hundred Great Years: The Story of the Times-Picayune from Its Founding to 1940*, revd., 365-66.
- Dabney, Virginius, 125.
- Daniel, J. Walter W., 502.
- Daniel, Ruth, 372.
- Dart, Henry P., promotes historical activity, 35.
- Davenport, F. Garvin, 121; *Ante-Bellum Kentucky: A Social History, 1800-1860*, revd., 105-106.
- David Dale Owen: *Pioneer Geologist of the Middle West*, by Walter B. Hendrickson, noted, 128.
- Davie, Preston, 374.
- Davis, James, candidate for congressman, 477.
- Davis, Jefferson, 448; naval policy criticized, 157; observations concerning Civil War, 209-211.
- Davis, Reuben, in Mississippi politics, 54.
- De Alvo, Stephen, early preacher in Mississippi, 162.
- Dearborn, Henry, and Pantan-Leslie debts, 278-90.
- De Bow, James D. B., character and activities of, 404-423.
- Democratic party, in ante-bellum Georgia, 301, 304-307; and Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 317, 323, 329-30; in post-Civil War Mississippi, 37-58, 447-60.
- DeMorse Charles, biog., revd., 223-24.
- Denman, Clarence P., revs. Sellers' *The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943*, 364-65.
- "Description of Seargent S. Prentiss in 1838," ed. by Charles S. Sydnor, 475-79.
- Dinsmore, Silas, appointed Indian agent, 278; negotiations on Pantan-Leslie debts, 285-91.
- Divided We Stand*, by Walter P. Webb, revised edition, noted, 242.
- Dix, Dorothea L., 411.
- Dixon, Archibald, and repeal of Missouri Compromise, 315, 323.
- Dobbs, Arthur, preservation of North Carolina records, 9.
- Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities, 1942-1943*, noted, 241.
- Dodd, Dorothy, 231, 374.
- Donald, David H., 374; "The Scalawag in Mississippi Reconstruction," 447-60.
- Doolley, Oscar S., 231.
- Douglas, Stephen A., and slavery in the territories, 200; and Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 314, 323.
- Dowler, Bennett, physician in Louisiana, 443.
- Downing, Charles, register of East Florida land office, 180.
- Drake, Daniel, comments on health conditions in South, 426, 429, 435, 436.
- Draper, Lyman C., preservation of records, 14, 26.
- Drayton, John, 33.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt, (ed.), *Report of the First Conference of Negro Land-Grant Colleges for Co-ordinating a Program of Co-operative Social Studies*, noted, 243.
- Duckett, Thomas, plantation problems of, 346-48.

- Dugas, Louis A., physician in Georgia, 443.
 Dunbar, William, frontier scientist, 391, 396-97.
 Duncan, Bingham, 232.
 Dunning, William A., 458.
 Dupre, J. Huntley, 502.
- Early, Jubal A., 352; president of Southern Historical Society, 25.
 "Early Baptist Church in the Lower Southwest," by Walter B. Posey, 161-73.
 Easterby, James H., 231; revs. Paschal's *History of Wake Forest College*, 226-28.
 East Florida, British military establishment in, 63-77; federal land offices in, 180.
East Florida as a British Province, 1763-1784, by Charles L. Mowat, revd., 218-19.
 East Tennessee Historical Society, meetings noted, 123, 235.
 Eaton, Clement, 231, 371; "Winifred and Joseph Gales, Liberals in the Old South," 461-74.
 Eaves, Charles D., 241.
 Eckenrode, Hamilton J., 25.
 "Economic Sectionalism in Georgia Politics, 1825-1855," by Paul Murray, 293-307.
Edward Douglas White, Chief Justice of the United States, by Sister Marie Carolyn Klinkhamer, revd., 228-29.
 Edwards, Everett E., (ed.), *Jefferson and Agriculture*, noted, 127.
 Eliot, John, British official in Florida, 71.
 Ellicott, Andrew, 397.
 Ellis, Elmer, 232.
 Ellis, John, 397.
 Emory University, *Sources and Reprints*, noted, 127, 379.
 English, Thomas H., (ed.), "Autobiography of 'The Countryman,' 1866," noted, 127.
 Etheridge, Emerson, in Kansas-Nebraska discussion, 326, 327.
 Eustis, William, and Indian debts, 290-91.
 Evans, George Henry, ante-bellum land reformer, 267.
 Eve, Paul F., physician in Georgia, 443.
Exile Without an End, by Chapman J. Milling, revd., 215-16.
- Falkner, William C., Chickasaw land speculation, 89.
 Farish, Hunter D., 125.
 Farrar, Robert, British officer at Mobile, 63.
 Farrar, Benjamin, 397.
 Fenner, Erasmus D., comments on epidemics in South, 431, 438.
 Ferguson, James S., 373.
Fiddlers in the Cumberlands, ed. by Lela M. Blankenship, noted, 379.
 Fillmore, Millard, 204.
 "Financing and Marketing the Sugar Crop of the Old South," by J. Carlyle Sitterson, 188-99.
 Fish, Hamilton, attitude toward South, 255.
 Fitzhugh, George, biog., revd., 356-59.
 Fitzpatrick, Benjamin, 151.
 Flanders, Ralph B., 78; revs. Saye's *New Viewpoints in Georgia History*, 213-15.
 Florida, preservation of records, 13; establishes archives, 35; British military establishment in, 63-77; territorial land problems in, 174-87; population distribution, 183; and Indian debt problem, 275-92; senatorial election in, 139; secession of, 150-51; Progressive party in, 480.
 Florida Historical Society, meeting noted, 374; acquisitions of, 234, 507.
 Folch, Vicente, Spanish governor of Florida, 283.
 Forbes, John, becomes head of Panton, Leslie and Company, 278; efforts to collect Indian debts, 278-92.
 Forbes, John Murray, interest in southern resources, 257.
 Force, Peter, 31.
 Ford, Worthington C., comments on preservation of records, 21, 27, 35-36.
 Forman, Ezekiel, in early Natchez society, 395.
Forman's Our Republic, revised by Fremont P. Wirth, noted, 380.
 Forstall, Edmond, interest in manuscripts, 35.
 Forster, Anthony, founder of Unitarian church in Charleston, 466-67.
 Fossan, Emil, (coed.), *Calendar of Maryland State Papers; No. 1, The Black Books*, revd., 97-98.
 Foster, Benjamin, comment on southern education, 272-73.
 Franklin, W. Neil, 503; revs. Alden's *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier*, 491-92.
 Freeman, Douglas Southall, 25.
 Freeport question, precedent for in Georgia, 200-207.
 French, Benjamin F., interest in manuscripts, 35.
 Fremont, John C., 204.
 Fries, Adelaide L., *The Road to Salem*, revd., 217-18.
- Gage, Thomas, British commander in chief in America, 62-64; redistribution of troops, 67-74.
 Gales, Joseph, as newspaper editor, 461-64; liberal activities of, 464-74.
 Gales, Joseph, Jr., edits *National Intelligencer*, 463, 471.
 Gales, Winifred, liberalism of, 461-74.
 Ganaway, Loomis M., *New Mexico and the Sectional Controversy, 1846-1861*, revd., 494-95.

- Gannon, Mrs. Nelle Upshaw, 502.
 Garrard, James, governor of Kentucky, 474.
 Garrison, William Lloyd, comments on Clay, 338.
 Gaston, William, liberalism of, 472-74.
 Gayangos, Pascual de, collector of manuscripts, 35.
 Gayarré, Charles E. A., promotes collection of manuscripts, 34-35; friendship with De Bow, 411, 415, 417, 419-20.
 Gayoso de Lemos, Manuel, Spanish governor at Natchez, 162, 394, 398; and Indian land cessions, 277.
 Gentry, Meredith P., and Tennessee Whigs, 309, 310, 312.
 George, James Z., 42.
George Fitzhugh: Propagandist of the Old South, by Harvey Wish, revd., 356-59.
George W. Littlefield, Texan, by J. Evetts Haley, revd., 116-17.
 Georgia, preservation of records, 12-13, 31-32; historical activities in, 24; economic sectionalism in, 293-307; discussion of state sovereignty in, 200-207; health conditions in, 424, 426, 429-30, 435; medical profession in, 440-41, 443-44; Progressive party in, 80; book on, revd., 213-15.
 "Georgia Precedent for the Freeport Question," by Horace Montgomery, 200-207.
 Gholson, Samuel J., candidate for congressman, 475, 476.
 Gibbes, Robert W., 33.
 Gibbs, Lewis R., influence on De Bow, 407.
 Giddings, Joshua, 340.
 Gilman, Samuel, Unitarian minister, 465, 467.
 Gilmer, George R., in Georgia politics, 301.
 Girault, John, early settler at Natchez, 390.
 Godard, Doris, (coed.), *Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook*, revd., 495-98.
 Goldman, Eric F., *Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Earlier Career*, revd., 117-19.
 Gondos, Victor, Jr., 378.
 Grady, Henry W., biog., revd., 114-15.
 Graham, George, land official in Florida, 178-79.
 Graham, William A., and preservation of North Carolina records, 29.
 Grant, James, governor of East Florida, 66, 69, 70, 72.
 Grant, Ulysses S., 457.
 Green, Fletcher M., 78, 121, 231, 371, 372; revs. Berger's *The British Traveller in America, 1836-1860*, 106-107.
 Greene, Evarts B., *The Revolutionary Generation, 1763-1790*, revd., 98-99.
 Greene, Lorenzo J., *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* revd., 96-97.
Growth of American Thought, by Merle Curti, revd., 359-60.
 Hackett, Charles W., 233.
 Hackley, Robert, register of Tallahassee land office, 180.
 Haggard, J. Villasano, 241.
 Haldimand, Frederick, British commander of Southern district, 64-65; transfers headquarters, 69-72; in correspondence with Gage, 75.
 Hale, Edward Everett, attitude toward South, 256.
 Haley, J. Evetts, *George W. Littlefield, Texan*, revd., 116-17.
 Halsell, Willie D., "James R. Chalmers and 'Mahoneism' in Mississippi," 37-58.
 Hamberlin, William, early preacher in Mississippi, 162.
 Hamilton, J. G. de Roulhac, 371; "Three Centuries of Southern Records, 1607-1907," 3-36.
 Hamilton, William B., 373; "The Southwestern Frontier, 1795-1817: An Essay in Social History," 389-403.
 Hammond, George P., 372.
 Hanna, Alfred J., 121, 235, 373; (coauth.), *The St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities*, revd., 119-20.
 Hanna, Kathryn Abbey, 232, 371, 373.
 Hanna, Paul L., 232.
 Harrington, Fred H., 374, 501.
 Harris, Julian, letter from Theodore Roosevelt to, 481-88; letter to Theodore Roosevelt, 488-90.
 Harrison, Fairfax, 23.
 Harrison, William Henry, 338.
 Hartridge, Walter C., (ed.), *The Letters of Don Juan McQueen to His Family, Written from Spanish East Florida, 1791-1807*, noted, 128.
 Hatcher, William B., 372; revs. Meade's *Judah P. Benjamin: Confederate Statesman*, 111-12.
 Hawkesworth, William, influence on De Bow, 407.
 Hawkins, Benjamin, and Indian debt question, 280-81, 285, 287, 291-92.
 Hayes, Rutherford B., comment on southern resources, 265.
 Hayne, Paul H., 412; collection of letters, revd., 362-64; communication on, 498-99.
 Hayward, Elijah, land official in Florida, 178-79.
 Hazard, Ebenezer, and Massachusetts state historical society, 24.
 "Health and the Medical Profession in the Lower South, 1845-1860," by Martha C. Mitchell, 424-46.
 Heartman, Charles F., (cocomp.), *A Bibliography of First Printings of the Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*, revd., 223.
 Henderson, John, early settler at Natchez, 391.
 Hendrickson, Walter B., *David Dale Owen:*

- Pioneer Geologist of the Middle West*, noted, 128.
- Hening, William, attitude toward records, 3, 4, 7, 21.
- Henry, Gustavus A., and Tennessee Whigs, 311-13.
- Henry W. Grady: *Spokesman of the New South*, by Raymond B. Nixon, revd., 114-15.
- Hentz, Nicholas M., 471.
- Hewes, William G., New Orleans factor, 191.
- Hill, James, Negro politician in Mississippi, 40, 42; Republican leader, 46-49; delegate to national Republican convention, 54, 55, 56.
- Hilldrup, Robert L., revs. Wright and Tilling's (eds.) *Quebec to Carolina in 1783-1786*, 219-21.
- Hillsborough, Earl of, secretary of state for American affairs, 69, 72.
- Hillyer, Junius, in debate on state sovereignty, 205-206.
- Historical Atlas of the United States*, by Clifford L. and Elizabeth H. Lord, noted, 127.
- Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook*, ed. by Christopher Crittenden and Doris Godard, revd., 495-98.
- History of Castillo de San Marcos and Fort Matanzas from Contemporary Narratives and Letters*, ed. by Albert C. Manucy, noted, 242.
- History of Wake Forest College*, Volume II, 1865-1905; Volume III, 1905-1943, by George W. Paschal, revd., 226-28.
- Hocoy, Clyde R., addresses and letters, noted, 380.
- Holcombe, Hosea, early preacher in Alabama, 164, 166.
- Holley, Horace, conservative opposition to, 470.
- Holt, Joseph, secretary of war, 152.
- Hooper, Samuel, New England industrialist, 261-62.
- Horn, Stanley F., 122, 231, 371.
- Houston, Sam, defends Matthew F. Maury in Senate, 142.
- Howard, Charles W., collector of records for Georgia, 12.
- Howard Society, charitable organization in New Orleans, 427.
- Hull, John T., in Mississippi politics, 52.
- Hunter, Robert M. T., on ship subsidy plans, 146.
- Hutchins, Anthony, in early Natchez society, 395, 399.
- I Can Go Home Again*, by Arthur G. Powell, revd., 229-30.
- Indians, and Pantton-Leslie debts, 275-92.
- Inge, William R., quoted, 21.
- Innerarity, James, and Pantton-Leslie debts, 283-84.
- Innerarity, John, and Creek Indian affairs, 288, 291.
- Inter American Intellectual Interchange*, noted, 127.
- Ivy, V. H., gives testimonial for De Bow, 416.
- Jackson, Andrew, 330, 336; opposition to in Georgia, 294.
- James, Ben, and Pantton-Leslie debt, 290.
- James Moore Wayne, *Southern Unionist*, by Alexander A. Lawrence, revd., 109-110.
- "James R. Chalmers and 'Mahoneism' in Mississippi," by Willie D. Halsell, 37-58.
- Jarvis, Thomas J., promotes publication of North Carolina records, 30.
- "J. D. B. De Bow, the Man," by Ottis C. Skipper, 404-423.
- Jefferson, Thomas, 240, 397, 401; attitude toward historical records, 3, 26; and Indian affairs, 279; and religious liberalism, 465-66, 471; books on, revd., 101-103, 221-22.
- Jefferson and Agriculture*, ed. by Everett E. Edwards, noted, 127.
- Jefferson and the Press*, by Frank L. Mott, revd., 221-22.
- Jeffords, Elza, in Mississippi politics, 42, 47, 48.
- Jensen, Merrill M., 374.
- John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier: *A Study of Indian Relations, War, Trade, and Land Problems in the Southern Wilderness, 1754-1775*, by John R. Alden, revd., 491-92.
- Johns, Martha E., marriage to J. D. B. De Bow, 415-17.
- Johnson, Andrew, elected governor of Tennessee, 311; as military governor, 258, 268.
- Johnson, Cave, in Tennessee politics, 313.
- Johnson, Cecil, revs. Mowat's *East Florida as a British Province, 1763-1784*, 218-19.
- Johnson, Guion Griffiths, 372.
- Johnson, Herschel V., in Georgia politics, 304.
- Johnston, Albert Sidney, Davis comments on, 208-209.
- Johnston, Gabriel, preservation of North Carolina records, 8, 9.
- Johnston, William Preston, preservation of records, 14; Davis' suggestions to, 207-211.
- Johnstone, George, British governor of West Florida, 63, 64-65.
- Jones, Dorsey D., 501.
- Jones, James C., Whig senator from Tennessee, 310, 312; supports repeal of Missouri Compromise, 315-17.

- Jones, Joel J., in Tennessee legislature, 318.
 Jones, J. William, 25.
Judah P. Benjamin: Confederate Statesman, by Robert D. Meade, revd., 111-12.
 Julian, George W., favors confiscation of southern land, 267-68.
- Kane, Harnett T., *The Bayous of Louisiana*, noted, 128.
 Kansas-Nebraska Bill, discussion of, in Georgia, 200-207; attitude of Tennessee Whigs on, 308-330.
 Kellar, Herbert A., 375.
 Kelley, William D., on immigration to the South, 263.
 Kellogg, Louise P., on Draper collection, 26-27.
Kendall of the Picayune: Being his Adventures in New Orleans, on the Texas Santa Fe Expedition, in the Mexican War, and in the Colonization of the Texas Frontier, by Fayette Copeland, revd., 107-109.
 Kentucky, preservation of records, 15; historical work in, 24, 35; liberalism in, 474; book on, revd., 105-106.
 Ker, David, early settler at Natchez, 391.
 King, Grace, quoted, 34.
 King, Thomas Butler, in Georgia politics, 299.
 Klinkhamer, Sister Marie Carolyn, *Edward Douglas White, Chief Justice of the United States*, revd., 228-29.
 Knoles, George H., revs. Koch's *The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson*, 101-103.
 Know Nothing party, activities in Georgia, 203-206.
 Koch, Adrienne, *The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson*, revd., 101-103.
- Labaree, Leonard W., 125.
 Lamar, Lucius Q. C., in Mississippi politics, 38-39, 55, 57.
 Lamb, E. James, supports Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 317.
 "Land Speculation Profits in the Chickasaw Cession," by James W. Silver, 84-92.
 Lanning, John Tate, 232; (ed.), *Brief Description of the Province of Carolina on the Coasts of Floreda*, noted, 380-81.
 Lawrence, Alexander A., *James Moore Wayne, Southern Unionist*, revd., 109-110.
 Lawrence, Amos A., interest in southern land, 260, 267.
 Lawrence, Frank W., 260.
 Lea, Luke, in Mississippi politics, 41.
 Leslie, Alexander, British commander of Southern district, 76.
Letters of Don Juan McQueen to His Family, Written from Spanish East Florida, 1791-1807, ed. by Walter C. Hartridge, noted, 128.
- Levy, David, Florida territorial delegate, 186. *See also*, Yulee, David L.
 Library of Congress, manuscript accessions of, 375, 504-505.
 Limbaugh, Christian, and Creek Indian debts, 291-92.
 Lincoln, Abraham, 259; and the Freeport question, 200-201.
 Link, Arthur S., (ed.), "Correspondence Relating to the Progressive Party's 'Lily White' Policy in 1912," 480-90.
 Littlefield, George W., biog., revd., 116-17.
 Long, Crawford W., physician in Georgia, 443.
 Lonn, Ella, revs. Ramsdell's *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, 360-62.
 Lord, Clifford L., *Historical Atlas of the United States*, noted, 127-28.
 Lossing, Benson J., collects historical records, 22.
 Louisiana, preservation of records, 13; historical activities in, 24, 34-35; early Baptist church in, 163, 164-65, 172; operation of sugar plantations in, 188-99; health conditions in, 424-28; medical profession in, 440-45.
 Louisiana Historical Society, meetings noted, 374.
 Louisiana State University, manuscript acquisitions, 507.
 Lowry, Robert, in Mississippi politics, 55.
 Lucas, H. R., resolution on Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 317-18.
 Luzenberg, C. A., physician in Louisiana, 443.
 Lynch, John R., in Mississippi politics, 38-41, 52-54.
 Lynch, William O., 231, 371.
- McArthur, Archibald, British commander of the Southern district, 76.
 McCloy, Shelby T., 502.
 McCollam, Andrew, financing and marketing of sugar crop, 191, 194.
 McDonald, Angus, collector of manuscripts for Virginia, 30.
 McGinty, Garnie W., revs. Klinkhamer's *Edward Douglas White, Chief Justice of the United States*, 228-29.
 McGirr, Newman F., 234, 509.
 McIntosh, William, and Creek Indian debt, 291.
 McKee, George C., in Mississippi politics, 41, 42.
 McKee, John, Indian agent, 276, 278.
 McKeithan, Daniel M., (ed.), *A Collection of Hayne Letters*, revd., 362-64; communication from, 498-99.
 McLean, Ross H., 121.
 MacLeish, Archibald, 124.
 McLemore, Richard A., *An Outline of Mississippi History*, noted, 242.

- Macmillan, Margaret B., *The War Governors in the American Revolution*, revd., 99-101.
- McMurtrie, Douglas C., deceased, 503.
- McPherson, John H. T., 501.
- McQueen, Juan, publication of letters, noted, 128.
- Magne, Felix, and collection of records, 35.
- Mahone, William, 37.
- "Mahoneism," in Mississippi politics, 37-58.
- Mallory, Stephen R., early career of, 137-38; election to Senate, 139-40; as chairman of Committee on Naval Affairs, 141-49; attitude toward secession, 150-52; Confederate secretary of the navy, 153-60.
- Manning, Vannoy H., in Mississippi politics, 44, 46, 47-48, 52.
- Manucy, Albert C., *The History of Castillo de San Marcos and Fort Matanzas from Contemporary Narratives and Letters*, noted, 242.
- Marschalk, Andrew, early printer in Mississippi, 392.
- Martin, François Xavier, obtains Louisiana records, 34.
- Martin, Sidney Walter, 231, 241, 372; "The Public Domain in Territorial Florida," 174-87; revs. Lawrence's *James Moore Wayne, Southern Unionist*, 109-110.
- Maryland, historical activities in, 24, 31, 35.
- Maryland Historical Society, manuscript accessions of, 123-24, 238-39, 377, 507.
- Massachusetts, establishment of first state historical society, 23-24.
- Mauzy, Matthew F., controversy over retirement of, 141-44; criticizes Confederate naval policy, 157-58.
- Mayo, Bernard, 79, 124; revs. Mott's *Jefferson and the Press*, 221-22.
- Mayo, Peter, description of Sergeant S. Prentiss, 476-79.
- Meade, Elizabeth W., (coed), *Calendar of Maryland State Papers: No. 1, The Black Books*, revd., 97-98.
- Meade, Robert D., 231; *Judab P. Benjamin: Confederate Statesman*, revd., 111-12.
- Medical profession, in the Lower South, 424-46.
- Meisen, Adolph F., 241.
- Melvin, Philip, "Stephen Russell Mallory, Southern Naval Statesman," 137-60.
- Meriwether, Colyer, historical interests of, 25-26.
- Miller, George J., (coed.), *The Burlington Court Book: A Record of Quaker Jurisprudence in West New Jersey, 1680-1709*, noted, 243.
- Miller, H. Prentice, "The Authorship of *The Slaveholder Abroad*," 92-94.
- Milling, Chapman J., *Exile Without an End*, revd., 215-16.
- Mills, Samuel J., report on conditions in Louisiana, 172.
- Mississippi, preservation of records, 13, 34; historical activity in, 24, 35; early Baptist church in, 161-63, 164, 169-73; social progress in, 389-403; health conditions in, 429, 439-41; Reconstruction politics in, 37-58, 447-60; Progressive party in, 480.
- Mississippi Valley Historical Association, annual meeting, 373-74.
- Missouri, preservation of records, 24, 35.
- Missouri, University of, acquisitions by library, 240.
- Missouri Compromise, debate on repeal of, 315-27.
- Mitchell, Martha C., "Health and the Medical Profession in the Lower South, 1845-1860," 424-46.
- Mobile, epidemics at, 429, 431.
- Moffitt, James W., 502.
- Moger, Allen W., 373; revs. Goldman's *Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Earlier Career*, 117-19.
- Moloney, John F., *Cotton in Peace and War*, noted, 242.
- Money, Hernando D., election to Congress, 47.
- Montgomery, Horace, "A Georgia Precedent for the Freeport Question," 200-207.
- Moore, John M., land official in Florida, 184.
- Moore, Richard C., criticism of Unitarians, 467.
- Morchead, John M., interest in North Carolina records, 29.
- Morgan, James B., in Mississippi politics, 55-56.
- Morgan, J. P., in controversy concerning documents, 22-23.
- Morrison, William B., deceased, 503.
- Morton, Richard L., 125, 241.
- Mott, Frank L., *Jefferson and the Press*, revd., 221-22.
- Mowat, Charles L., "The Southern Brigade: A Sidelight on the British Military Establishment in America, 1763-1775," 59-77; *East Florida as a British Province, 1763-1784*, revd., 218-19.
- Muldraw, Henry L., election to Congress, 47.
- Mullett, Charles F., revs. Macmillan's *The War Governors in the American Revolution*, 99-101.
- Murray, Ellen Fenton, 502.
- Murray, James, British official in America, 62.
- Murray, Paul, 372; "Economic Sectionalism in Georgia Politics, 1825-1855," 293-307.
- Natchez, early social conditions at, 389-403.
- National Archives, accessions of, 126, 239, 376, 506; *Ninth Annual Report*, noted, 375; other publications of, noted, 240, 378.

- Negro, and early Baptist church, 168-69; health conditions of, 433-36; in Mississippi politics, 38-55, 450-60; and Progressive party, 480-90.
- Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776*, by Lorenzo J. Greene, revd., 96-97.
- Nelson, Thomas A. R., and Tennessee Whigs, 309-313.
- Nettels, Curtis P., 125.
- New England Emigrant Aid Company, 259-60.
- New England Loyal Publication Society, organizers of, 257, 262.
- New Mexico and the Sectional Controversy, 1846-1861*, by Loomis M. Ganaway, revd., 494-95.
- New Orleans, Baptist church in, 164; and marketing of sugar crop, 189-99; health conditions in, 427-31; medical schools in, 442.
- New Viewpoints in Georgia History*, by Albert B. Saye, revd., 213-15.
- Nicholson, John, early preacher in Alabama, 163.
- Niles, Henry, in Mississippi politics, 41.
- Niles, Hezekiah, editor of *Niles' Register*, 464.
- Niles, Jason, in Mississippi politics, 41.
- Nixon, Raymond B., *Henry W. Grady: Spokesman of the New South*, revd., 114-15; revs. Dabney's *One Hundred Great Years: The Story of the Times-Picayune*, 365-66.
- North, attitudes concerning southern resources, 253-74.
- North, James H., Confederate agent abroad, 155.
- North Carolina, preservation of records, 7-9, 28-30; historical society founded, 24; establishment of archives, 35; liberal activities in, 463-74.
- North Carolina, Department of Archives and History, manuscript accessions by, 235-36, 377.
- North Carolina, University of, manuscript accessions by library, 236-38.
- Norton, Charles Eliot, attitude toward South, 257.
- "Notes on the Civil War Correspondence of Private Henry Tucker," by Hubert A. Coleman, 343-55.
- Nott, Josiah C., comments on health conditions, 433, 437; contributions to medical progress, 434, 442-43.
- Odum, Howard W., *Race and Rumors of Race: Challenge to American Crisis*, noted, 129.
- Oklahoma Historical Society, elects officers, 234.
- Oliver, Samuel W., 336.
- One Hundred Great Years: The Story of the Times-Picayune from Its Founding to 1940*, by Thomas E. Dabney, revd., 365-66.
- O'Reilly, Alexandro, governor of Louisiana, 72.
- Osborn, George C., 502.
- Outline of Mississippi History*, by Richard A. McLemore, noted, 242.
- Owen, David D., biog., noted, 128.
- Owen, Thomas M., 25, 35.
- Owsley, Frank L., 371; revs. Andrews' *The Soul of a Nation: The Founding of Virginia and the Projection of New England*, 95-96.
- Page, Thomas Nelson, 25.
- Palmer, William P., on preservation of records, 18, 20.
- Panton, Leslie and Company, efforts to collect Indian debts, 275-92.
- Panton, William, and debts of southern Indians, 275-78.
- Pargellis, Stanley M., 125.
- Parker, Franklin N., (ed.), "A Diary-Letter Written from the Methodist General Conference of 1844 by the Rev. W. J. Parks," noted, 379.
- Parker, John M., urges Progressive "Lily White" policy, 481.
- Parks, Edd Winfield, revs. Heartman and Canny's (comps.) *A Bibliography of First Printings of the Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*, 223.
- Parks, Joseph H., "The Tennessee Whigs and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill," 308-330; revs. Davenport's *Ante-Bellum Kentucky: A Social History*, 105-106.
- Parks, W. J., letter on Methodist Conference, noted, 379.
- Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies*, by Mary P. Clarke, revd., 212-13.
- Parsons, John, land official in Florida, 181.
- Paschal, George W., *History of Wake Forest College*, Volumes II and III, revd., 226-28.
- Patrick, Rembert W., 232.
- Patton, James W., "Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer," 78-81; revs. Fries' *The Road to Salem*, 217-18.
- Payne, William O., deceased, 234.
- Peck, John M., comments on religion in lower Southwest, 164.
- Peebles, Cincinnatus, presents precedent for Freeport question, 205-206.
- Pendergrast, Garrett E., early physician at Natchez, 396.
- Pensacola, British military establishment at, 64, 66-67, 70-75; land office at, 174-75; at beginning of Civil War, 151-52.
- Perkins, John, interest in manuscripts, 35.
- Perry, Benjamin F., 332.
- Perry, M. S., governor of Florida, 151.
- Philbrick, Edward S., interest in southern resources, 260-62.

- Pilgrimage of Liberty*, ed. by Edgar E. Brandon, noted, 379.
- Pills, Petticoats, and Plows: The Southern Country Store*, by Thomas D. Clark, revd., 366-69.
- Plain People of the Confederacy*, by Bell I. Wiley, revd., 225-26.
- Poe, Caroline, first wife of J. D. B. De Bow, 414.
- Poe, Edgar Allan, bibliography of writings, revd., 223.
- Pollard, Edward A., criticizes Mallory's naval policy, 157-58.
- Pomfret, John E., 125.
- Possey, Walter B., 372, 374; "The Early Baptist Church in the Lower Southwest," 161-73; revs. Abell's *The Urban Impact on American Protestantism*, 112-14; revs. Thrift's *Trail of the Florida Circuit Rider*, 493-94.
- Potter, Henry, opposes Unitarians, 470.
- Powell, Arthur G., *I Can Go Home Again*, revd., 229-30.
- Pratt, Harry E., (comp.), *Concerning Mr. Lincoln*, noted, 379-80.
- Prentiss, Seargent S., contemporary description of, 475-79.
- Priestley, Herbert I., deceased, 233.
- Priestley, Joseph, Gales' friendship with, 462, 466.
- Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943*, by James B. Sellers, revd., 364-65.
- Progressive party, correspondence on "Lily White" policy of, 480-90.
- "Public Domain in Territorial Florida," by Sidney Walter Martin, 174-87.
- Quebec to Carolina in 1785-1786: Being the Travel Diary and Observations of Robert Hunter, Jr., a Young Merchant of London*, ed. by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling, revd., 219-21.
- Queener, Verton M., 231.
- Race and Rumors of Race: Challenge to American Crisis*, by Howard W. Odum, noted, 129.
- Ramsdell, Charles W., *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, revd., 360-62.
- Ramsey, John F., 121.
- Ranck, James B., 231.
- Randolph, John, and preservation of records, 17.
- Ready, Charles, 308; and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 325-26, 327.
- Reconstruction, northern economic interests in, 253-74; Mississippi politics during, 447-60.
- Records, historical, preservation of in the South, 3-36.
- Records, Ralph H., 502.
- Records of the Columbia Historical Society of Washington, D. C., 1942-1943*, noted, 509.
- Reed, H. Clay, (coed.), *The Burlington Court Book: A Record of Quaker Jurisprudence in West New Jersey, 1680-1709*, noted, 243.
- Report of the First Conference of Negro Land-Grant Colleges for Co-ordinating a Program of Co-operative Social Studies*, ed. by W. E. B. Du Bois, noted, 243.
- Republican party, in Mississippi, 40-58, 447-60.
- Revolutionary Generation, 1763-1790*, by Evarts B. Greene, revd., 98-99.
- Reynolds, Alfred W., 121.
- Rice, Madeleine H., *American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy*, revd., 492-93.
- Richardson, Rupert N., revs. Ganaway's *New Mexico and the Sectional Controversy*, 494-95.
- Richardson, William A., sponsors Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 322.
- Road to Salem*, by Adelaide L. Fries, revd., 217-18.
- Robert, Joseph C., 121.
- Robertson, James, appointed Indian commissioner, 280, 285.
- Robison, Daniel M., 121, 231.
- Rodney, Thomas, early Mississippi judge, 401.
- Roe, Clara G., 241.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, and Progressive party, 480; correspondence on "Lily White" policy, 481-90.
- Ross, Earle D., 374.
- Rowan, Matthew, statement regarding records, 9.
- Ruffin, Edmund, interest in Bland papers, 18.
- Russell, Sam, land official in Florida, 181.
- Sainsbury, W. Noel, 30.
- St. Augustine, British military establishment at, 66, 69-75; land office at, 174, 178, 180-82.
- St. Augustine Historical Society, activities of, 235.
- St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities*, by Branch Cabell and A. J. Hanna, revd., 119-20.
- Salley, Alexander S. quoted, 10.
- Samaritans, charitable organization in New Orleans, 427.
- Samson, George W., testimonial for De Bow, 408.
- Sarkiss, Harry J., 232.
- Saunders, William L., edits North Carolina records, 30.
- Savannah, yellow fever epidemic in, 429-30.
- Saye, Albert B., *New Viewpoints in Georgia History*, revd., 213-15.
- "Scalawag in Mississippi Reconstruction," by David H. Donald, 447-60.

- Schultz, Harold, 241.
 Scomp, Henry A., and loss of Georgia records, 13.
 Scott, Winfield, 152; candidate for president, 309-310.
 Seaton, William W., edits *National Intelligencer*, 463.
 Sellers, James B., *The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943*, revd., 364-65.
 Seminole Indians, and land cessions, 277, 282.
 Setser, Vernon G., 378.
 Seward, William H., 308.
 Shanks, Henry T., 231, 371; revs. Wiley's *The Plain People of the Confederacy*, 225-26.
 Shaw, Arthur M., (ed.), "Some Post-War Observations of Jefferson Davis Concerning Early Aspects of the Civil War," 207-211.
 Shelburne, Earl of, 66, 68.
 Sherrieff, Florence Janson, 502.
 Shippee, Lester B., deceased, 233.
 Silliman, Benjamin, 470.
 Silver, James W., 371; "Land Speculation Profits in the Chickasaw Cession," 84-92.
 Simmons, W. H., register of East Florida land office, 180.
 Simms, Henry H., 231.
 Simon, Louis A., 378.
 Simpson, William, agent of Pantton, Leslie and Company, 281-82, 286-87, 289-91.
 Sims, J. Marion, physician in Alabama, 434, 443.
 Singleton, Otho R., election to Congress, 47, 56.
 Sitterson, J. Carlyle, 232; "Financing and Marketing the Sugar Crop of the Old South," 188-99.
 Skipper, Ottis C., 231, 241; "J. D. B. De Bow, the Man," 404-423; revs. Wallace's *Charles DeMorse: Pioneer Editor and Statesman*, 223-24.
Slaveholder Abroad, note on authorship of, 92-94.
 Slaves, health conditions among, 433-36.
 Slidell, John, 151.
 Smith, George Winston, 374; "Some Northern Wartime Attitudes toward the Post-Civil War South," 253-74.
 Smith, Gerrit, comments on Clay, 338.
 Smith, Henry Nash, 233.
 Smith, James Power, 25.
 Smith, Philander, 397.
 "Some Northern Wartime Attitudes toward the Post-Civil War South," by George Winston Smith, 253-74.
 "Some Post-War Observations of Jefferson Davis Concerning Early Aspects of the Civil War," ed. by Arthur M. Shaw, 207-211.
Soul of a Nation: The Founding of Virginia and the Projection of New England, by Matthew P. Andrews, revd., 95-96.
 South, and preservation of records, 3-36; financing and marketing sugar crop, 188-99; northern attitudes toward, 253-74; health and medical profession in, 424-46; liberal activities in, 461-74; Progressive party and, 480-90.
 South Carolina, preservation of records, 9-11, 32-34; historical society founded, 24; establishes archives, 35; Unionist sentiment in, 334-35; yellow fever in, 426.
 South Carolina, University of, manuscript accessions by library, 238.
 "Southern Brigade: A Sidelight on the British Military Establishment in America, 1763-1775," by Charles L. Mowat, 59-77.
 Southern Florida Historical Association, activities of, 234.
 Southern Historical Association, report of secretary, 78-79; finances of, 80-81; constitution and by-laws, 82-83; committees, of, 121, 231; plans for annual meeting, 231, 371.
 Southern Historical Society, founded, 25.
 Southern History Association, organized, 26.
 Southwest, early Baptist church in, 161-73.
 "Southwestern Frontier, 1795-1817: An Essay in Social History," by William B. Hamilton, 389-403.
 Sparks, Jared, friendship with Joseph and Winifred Gales, 465-69.
 Stanton, Edwin M., 139.
 Staples, Thomas S., 231.
 Starnes, Ebenezer, authorship of *The Slaveholder Abroad* attributed to, 93-94.
 State Rights party, in Georgia politics, 294-304.
 Stearns, George Luther, attitude toward South, 273.
 "Stephen Russell Mallory, Southern Naval Statesman," by Philip Melvin, 137-60.
 Stephenson, Wendell H., 121, 231, 371, 501.
 Stone, Warren, physician in Louisiana, 443.
 Stuart, Henry C., in controversy concerning documents, 22-23.
 Stuart, John, superintendent of Indian affairs, 66; biog., revd., 491-92.
 Sugar crop, financing and marketing of, 188-99.
 Sumner, Charles, opposes repeal of Missouri Compromise, 316, 320.
 Surget, Pierre, early settler at Natchez, 391.
 Swaim, William, 464.
 Swain, David L., and North Carolina records, 29.
 Swayze, Samuel, organizes church in Natchez district, 161.
 Swem, Earl G., 125, 241.
 Swint, Henry L., 122, 232.
 Sydnor, Charles S., 371, 374; (ed.), "A

- Description of Seargent S. Prentiss in 1838," 475-79; revs. *Rice's American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy*, 492-93.
- Tallahassee, federal land office at, 178-80.
- Tallahassee Historical Society, activities of, 374.
- Taney, Roger B., on slavery in the territories, 200, 207.
- Tarbell, Ida M., deceased, 233.
- Tattnall, Josiah, court martial of, 158.
- Taylor, William, British officer in Florida, 64.
- Taylor, A. Elizabeth, 241.
- Taylor, Nathaniel G., in Kansas-Nebraska debate, 326-27, 329.
- Taylor, Rhea A., 502.
- Taylor, Rosser H., 232.
- Tennessee, preservation of records, 14-15; historical society founded, 24; Whig conflicts in, 308-330.
- Tennessee Historical Society, meetings noted, 122, 234.
- "Tennessee Whigs and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill," by Joseph H. Parks, 308-330.
- Texas, preservation of records, 14, 34; historical society founded, 24; establishes archives, 35; yellow fever in, 426.
- Texas State Historical Association, annual meeting, noted, 373.
- Thayer, Eli, suggests migration to South, 266.
- Thirteenth Annual Report on Historical Collections, University of Virginia Library*, noted, 508.
- Thomas, Roger, (coed.), *Calendar of Maryland State Papers; No. 1, The Black Books*, revd., 97-98.
- Thompson, John R., 423.
- Thompson, Lewis, financing and marketing sugar crop, 191-92.
- Thompson, William Tappan, authorship of *The Slaveholder Abroad* attributed to, 92-94.
- "Three Centuries of Southern Records, 1607-1907," by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, 3-36.
- Thrift, Charles T., Jr., *Trail of the Florida Circuit Rider*, revd., 493-94.
- Thurmond, R. J., land speculation, 89.
- Tinling, Marion, (coed.), *Quebec to Carolina in 1785-1786: Being the Travel Diary and Observations of Robert Hunter, Jr., a Young Merchant of London*, revd., 219-21.
- Tompkins, Stuart R., 502.
- Toombs, Robert, 202; and Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 318, 327-28.
- Toucey, Isaac, secretary of the navy, 151, 152.
- Toulmin, Harry, codifies laws of Mississippi, 400.
- Townshend, Charles, 66.
- Trail of the Florida Circuit Rider*, by Charles T. Thrift, Jr., revd., 493-94.
- Travis, Alexander, Baptist leader in Alabama, 164.
- Trent, William P., quoted, 36.
- Trezevant, John, land speculation, 89.
- Troup, George M., as political leader in Georgia, 294-95.
- True, Wallace M., 232.
- Tryon, William, attitude toward records, 8.
- Tucker, Henry, Civil War correspondence of, 343-55.
- Turner, Joseph A., autobiography, noted, 127.
- Tyler, Lyon G., 241.
- Tyler, Moses Coit, comment on preservation of records, 19.
- Ulloa, Antonio de, Spanish official at New Orleans, 65.
- Unionism, early sentiment for in South Carolina, 332-35.
- Unitarians, southern attitude toward, 465-70.
- Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900*, by Aaron I. Abell, revd., 112-14.
- Van Buren, Martin, abolitionist opposition to, 339.
- Van Eaton, Henry S., election to Congress, 47, 56.
- Van Schreeven, William J., 378.
- Venable, Austin L., "William L. Yancey's Transition from Unionism to State Rights," 331-42.
- Virginia, preservation of records, 6-7, 11, 30-31; historical society founded, 24; establishes archives, 35.
- Virginia, University of, manuscript accession by library, 236.
- Visscher, Nina M., deceased, 122.
- Wade, Benjamin F., opposes repeal of Missouri Compromise, 316.
- Wake Forest College, history of, revd., 226-28.
- Walker, Robert J., 263.
- Wall, Bennett H., 372, 502.
- Wallace, Ernest, *Charles DeMorse: Pioneer Editor and Statesman*, revd., 223-24.
- Waller, John L., revs. Haley's *George W. Littlefield, Texan*, 116-17.
- Walsh, Ralph, British officer in Florida, 64-65.
- Walter Clark, Fighting Judge*, by Aubrey L. Brooks, revd., 369-70.
- War Governors in the American Revolution*, by Margaret B. Macmillan, revd., 99-101.
- Ward, George W., register of Tallahassee land office, 180.

- Ward, Samuel G., attitude toward South, 257.
- Ware, Harvey R., Mississippi politician, 41.
- Ware, Nathaniel A., secretary of Mississippi Territory, 396.
- Washington, Henry, register of Tallahassee land office, 180.
- Washington, Martha, controversy over preservation of will, 22-23.
- Waterhouse, Benjamin, 465.
- Wayland, John W., *The Bowmans*, noted, 379.
- Wayne, James M., biog. revd., 109-110.
- Weaver, Herbert, 501.
- Webb, Walter P., 372; *Divided We Stand*, noted, 242.
- Wedderburn, David, British officer at Mobile, 63-64.
- Weeks, Stephen B., interest in records, 7-8, 25, 26.
- Wells, C. H., Unionist editor, 333.
- Wertenbaker, Thomas J., 125.
- West Florida, British military establishments in, 63-77; federal land offices in, 179-80.
- Whig party, in Georgia politics, 304-307; of Tennessee and Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 308-330; efforts to revive in Mississippi, 448-60.
- Whipple, Henry B., on conditions in New Orleans, 164.
- Whitaker, Daniel, Unitarian preacher, 470-71.
- Whitaker, Jonathan, 470.
- White, Edward D., biog., revd., 228-29.
- White, Maunsel, friendship with De Bow, 411-12.
- Whitfield, Theodore M., revs. Aptheker's *American Negro Slave Revolts*, 103-105.
- Wiley, Bell Irvin, *The Plain People of the Confederacy*, revd., 225-26.
- Wilkinson, James, and Pantton-Leslie debts, 275, 280-82.
- William and Mary Quarterly*, inaugurates new series, 241-42.
- "William L. Yancey's Transition from Unionism to State Rights," by Austin L. Venable, 331-42.
- Williams, Christopher H., and Tennessee Whigs, 309-310.
- Williams, Mary W., deceased, 233.
- Williams, T. Harry, 121.
- Willis, Joseph, early Baptist preacher, 163, 169.
- Wilson, Samuel M., 231.
- Wilson, William L., historical interests of, 26.
- Wimberly, A. T., in Mississippi politics, 44.
- Winans, William, early settler in Natchez, 395-96, 398.
- "Winifred and Joseph Gales, Liberals in the Old South," by Clement Eaton, 461-74.
- Winkler, Ernest W., 231.
- Wirth, Fremont P., *Forman's Our Republic*, noted, 380.
- Wish, Harvey, *George Fitzhugh: Propagandist of the Old South*, revd., 356-59; revs. Greene's *The Negro in Colonial New England*, 96-97.
- Woodfin, Maude H., 121, 231.
- Woodward, C. Vann, revs. Nixon's *Henry W. Grady: Spokesman of the New South*, 114-15.
- Woody, Robert H., 79, 121.
- Word, Robert, physician in Georgia, 439.
- Word, Thomas J., candidate for congressman, 475-77.
- Wright, Louis B., 125; (coed.), *Quebec to Carolina in 1785-1786: Being the Travel Diary and Observations of Robert Hunter, Jr., a Young Merchant of London*, revd., 219-21.
- Wright, Marcus J., historical interests of, 25, 26.
- Yancey, William L., transition from Unionism to state rights, 331-42.
- Young, J. Harvey, 232.
- Yulee, David L., Florida senator, 139, 151. See also, Levy, David.
- Zollicoffer, Felix K., and Tennessee Whigs, 312; in Kansas-Nebraska debate, 324-25, 327.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

•

PRESIDENT

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina (1944)

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1945)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

ALFRED J. HANNA, Rollins College (1944)

BERNARD MAYO, University of Virginia (1944)

WILLIAM G. BEAN, Washington and Lee University (1945)

JENNINGS B. SANDERS, Memphis State College (1945)

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)